THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 152 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · FEBRUARY 15, 1941 NUMBER 7

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 169

EDITORIALS

H. R. 1776 172

Vienna 1934: The First Battle *by Franz Hoellering* 173

Why Hitler Hesitates *by Freda Kirchwey* 174

ARTICLES

Belated Magna Carta *by I. F. Stone* 175

British Communists Help Hitler *by Harold J. Laski* 176

Tax for Defense *by Maxwell S. Stewart* 178

Spain in Prison *Anonymous* 181

Missouri Has No Governor *by Irving Dilliard* 183

Everybody's Business *by Keith Hutchison* 184

In the Wind 185

A Native at Large *by Jonathan Daniels* 186

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Friends of Dr. Johnson *by Joseph Wood Krutch* 187

Gladiatorial *by Sherman Conrad* 187

Over the Burma Road *by Maxwell S. Stewart* 188

A Georgian Poet *by John Peale Bishop* 189

Banking: Two Views *by Paul M. Sweezy* 190

Genghis Khan *by Louis B. Salomon* 191

Photographs of New York *by Paul Rosenfeld* 191

Drama: The Irish of It *by Joseph Wood Krutch* 192

Films *by Anthony Bower* 192

Music *by B. H. Haggin* 194

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 195

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Washington Editor I. F. STONE
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1941, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Washington Bureau: 856 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

The Shape of Things

"SOBER CONFIDENCE" WAS THE KEYNOTE OF Winston Churchill's radio report to the nation, the Empire, and the neutral world, a confidence given substance by a long series of victories in the Mediterranean and by the proved ability of the island fortress to grow stronger despite punishing attacks. But the British Prime Minister at the same time warned against over-confidence. Hitler, he pointed out, must attempt to destroy Great Britain itself and while preparations to meet invasion have been immensely strengthened since last summer, it is only to be expected that the Nazis have been using the winter months to organize a far more formidable assault than they could have staged at that time. Nevertheless, Mr. Churchill was clearly as unconcerned about the state of domestic morale as he was anxious to combat defeatism in the neutral countries. He spoke particularly about the difficulties of convincing the small Balkan countries that by accepting Hitler's "new order" they were backing the wrong horse, but his words were also intended as an answer to those Americans who have so energetically been echoing Goebbels's thesis that Britain is doomed and American aid will be useless. More emphatically than ever before he declared Britain was not expecting the assistance of American armies. Its need was for war material and ships to transport it—and for our faith in its capacity to win out. We believe such confidence warranted and that there is no justification for Lindbergh's thesis that Britain cannot defeat Germany. The deciding factor will be nerves and there is reason to hope that, in the face of setbacks, German morale will prove as brittle as Italian.

*

THE DEAD CATS TOSSED BACK AND FORTH between President Roosevelt and Senator Wheeler make a rather sordid byplay to the controversy over the Lease-Lend bill. The exchange started when the Senator, never conspicuous for subtlety, described the measure as another "New Deal Triple-A foreign policy—plow under every fourth American boy." Mr. Wheeler's analysis, remarked the President, was "the rottenest thing that has been said in public life in a generation." *Touché!* Unfortunately the President was not content to stun his

foe and has lately been engaged in an unworthy effort to reduce him to a pulp. At a press conference he identified Wheeler as the unnamed Senator referred to in the late Ambassador Dodd's diary who is said to have remarked confidentially that Nazi domination of Europe was inevitable. What is more, Roosevelt implied, the Senator was not averse to such a catastrophe and even based his policy on it. Wheeler denied the whole story ("a slanderous attack on me—attributed to a dead man") and countered within a few days by charging that the President had given away so much American air strength that we now had not a single war plane capable of holding its own in a European war. Instead of analyzing this grave accusation Roosevelt merely remarked that of course one could work out all kinds of things with figures and that the Senator's interpretation must be very satisfactory to Adolf Hitler. That answer is fair neither to Senator Wheeler nor to the country, and it lowers the President's prestige. Even allowing for an inevitable degree of secrecy on military matters, the Administration has done a bad job of keeping the people posted on the general state of their defenses. That obligation is not lessened by the tactics required to carry on a private feud—even with so inviting a foe as Senator Wheeler.

*

COMPLAINTS REGARDING EXCESSIVE TAXES on business make interesting reading these days alongside reports of 1940 earnings. In one of the most recent of these reports, the General Motors Corporation indicated net earnings, after payment of all regular and excess-profits taxes, of $195,500,000, or $4.32 per share of common stock. This may be compared with earnings of $183,290,000, or $4.04 per share, in 1939, which was an exceptionally good year. An increase of $80,000,000 in taxes over the previous year was not sufficient to wipe out all the war gains. This was even more true of the steel companies which because of the capitalization provision in the Second Revenue Act of 1940 are practically exempt from the excess-profits levy. The United States Steel Corporation reported net profits of $102,181,000, or $8.84 a share, the highest since 1930. This was more than double the $41,226,000 profit for 1939. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation, with more defense orders, did still better. Its earnings of $48,677,000, or $14.01 a share, were one-sixth better than in 1929, the next best year in the corporation's history. These may be taken as illustrations of how we must all sacrifice for the defense program.

*

CHILD LABOR WOULD HAVE BEEN ILLEGAL in this country twenty-two years ago had not the Supreme Court in Hammer *v.* Dagenhart outlawed the 1916 Child Labor Law by a vote of five to four and made necessary the long, painful process of constitutional amendment. Justice Stone has specifically overruled that decision in holding that both the wage-hour and the child-labor provisions of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act are constitutional. Justice Holmes, as he noted in his famous dissent in the old child-labor case, could not understand why the federal government was allowed power to prevent the shipment of lottery tickets, impure foods and drugs, stolen goods, and convict manufactures in interstate commerce but denied the right to forbid the channels of interstate commerce to the products of child labor. "The conclusion is inescapable," Justice Stone now says, "that Hammer *v.* Dagenhart was a departure from the principles which have prevailed in the interpretation of the commerce clause both before and since the decision." The Supreme Court nevertheless managed to escape these inescapable conclusions for twenty-two years. The new decision, which was in no way surprising after the decisions upholding the Wagner and Guffey Acts, should not be used as a means of blocking ratification of the Child Labor Amendment. That is still needed to end child labor in intra-state business.

*

THE FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR HOUSING defense workers last summer have been almost entirely allocated, according to C. R. Palmer, Defense Housing Coordinator, and Congress is now to be asked for supplementary appropriations totaling $156,750,000. Of this sum $150,000,000 is to be used for the construction of 37,000 units in sixty defense areas and the balance is to be employed for providing temporary accommodations in places where there is urgent need for shelter for short periods. In addition, Mr. Palmer is asking for an amendment to the National Housing Act which would enable the FHA to set up a separate insurance fund to underwrite 90-per-cent mortgage loans on dwellings to be erected by private builders and either sold or rented. At present the FHA will insure loans of this proportion only when the builder is the owner-occupier and puts up a 10 per cent cash equity. By this change Mr. Palmer evidently hopes to lure private enterprise into defense housing. Perhaps he will do so, for most of the risk will be shouldered by the government while operators taking advantage of the scheme will have a fair chance of a speculative profit. What is not clear from Mr. Palmer's announcement is whether there is to be any control of rents in the case of houses built under this program. For rents are mounting in those areas where defense contracts have been concentrated. According to Miss Harriet Elliott, chief of the consumer division of the NDAC, increase of from 6 to 29 per cent in the year ending December last have been noted in a dozen districts. Rent takes from one-fifth to one-quarter of most workers' incomes and nothing is more likely to provoke demands for increased wages than a rise in rents. Nor, as we have

pointed out before, will men be willing or able to work longer hours when lack of houses near their jobs forces them to commute long distances.

✶

THE *WALL STREET JOURNAL* INFORMS US with refreshing frankness that "Squeeze plays were pulled everywhere on Army's rejection of Ford truck bid," and goes on to give the details, as follows:

> Squeeze No. 1: Army was ready to give Ford a negotiated contract for trucks. Competitors kicked. Army invited general bidding. Ford was low, Chrysler second. Labor clause barred Ford; Chrysler got the order.
>
> Squeeze No. 2: Army uses labor clause in bid invitations, omits it from negotiated and fixed-fee contracts. Soon it must either: (1) add clause to negotiated contracts or (2) drop it from competitive bidding.
>
> Using Ford case to stir resentment, generals and colonels hope to jettison labor clause entirely. Officers announcing Ford rejections told newsmen it showed arms costs are higher "just because labor uses defense program as club to unionize Ford."

We can think of worse uses for the defense program. Meanwhile, we think it would be a good idea if someone with a loud and authoritative voice told the generals and colonels that the right and the obligation to bargain collectively have been legally established and it is not their business to nullify federal laws.

✶

THE JAPANESE DRIVE NORTH OF HONG KONG, notable as the first important Japanese offensive in nearly a year, is a serious threat to China's supply line to the outside world. For contrary to the usual impression, China has been receiving a greater amount of supplies through devious routes along the South China coast than over the widely publicized Burma Road. Much of this has been smuggled in through Hong Kong and then transported to free China either by inland waterways or on the backs of coolies. The occupation of the area north of Hong Kong will not stop this traffic but it will tend to bring it all under Japanese control. Most of the goods now entering China is carried past the Japanese patrols after payment of an illegal bounty to the Japanese officers. This traffic is well organized, being controlled in many instances by written agreements between the importers and the highest Japanese naval officials. So profitable has this trade become that some observers have expressed doubt whether the Tokyo government could withdraw its troops and naval units from China even if it so ordered. Although the extension of Japanese control will not stop ordinary trade, particularly that of Japanese goods, it will cut down the flow of arms and ammunition destined for free China. For there is a limit even to Japanese cupidity.

ALTHOUGH THE BACKGROUND OF THE Cuban "revolt" remains somewhat obscure, there can be little doubt that President Batista's energetic measures saved the island from more serious disturbances. Colonel José Pedraza, former army chief, who was charged with leading the "seditious" clique, has long been known as an ardent pro-Nazi. While there is no evidence that the alleged plot against Batista was in any way the result of foreign influence, it may be assumed that a regime headed by the three plotters would have been more susceptible to totalitarian wiles than is the present government. There was a day when Batista maintained as ruthless a dictatorship as may be found on this side of the Atlantic, but during the past two or three years he has reestablished a large measure of practical democracy. His promptness in restoring full civil rights after temporarily suspending them at the time of the arrests, seems to indicate that he means to continue his experiment with the democratic method.

✶

CORPORATION LAWYERS IN VARIOUS PARTS of the country, apparently under guidance from some central source, are employing a new legal device for circumventing the Norris-La Guardia Act. It is an ingenious one and it is being used with alarming frequency and success. It is aimed immediately at the Teamsters' Union but is capable of being used against other unions as well. When a union employer refuses to handle non-union cargo, the affected non-union employer institutes proceedings to enjoin the "fair" carrier from refusing to handle non-union freight. Since such litigation is between employers, the courts have in general prohibited interference from interested unions which sought to show the existence of a labor dispute and the consequent applicability of the anti-injunction law. The sued employer, more often than not, is sympathetic to the action and does not contest it. The practice has become so widespread that Daniel T. Tobin, president of the teamsters, and Joseph A. Padway, general counsel, have assumed personal direction of a nationwide drive to combat it.

✶

WE HAVE RARELY ENCOUNTERED REASONING more specious than that adopted by Circuit Court Judges Maris, Clark, and Goodrich in the Agnes Fahy case. The judges confirm the Labor Board's finding that Miss Fahy was discharged by the Newark, New Jersey, *Ledger* for her activities as head of the Newark Newspaper Guild. But they rule that the board has no power to reinstate her or to punish an employer for an unfair labor practice once the employer has entered into a collective-bargaining agreement. We have no hesitation in saying that the Wagner Act affords no support for this extraordinary interpretation. It would invite the employer to enter into

an agreement with the union and then proceed to discharge its more militant members. This is exactly what happened in the Fahy case. Few cases coming before the Labor Board exhibit a more shameful record of interference by management in union affairs than this one. Miss Fahy, after eight years of employment by the *Ledger*, was discharged in September, 1937, as "a warning upon all other editorial employees of the hazards of militant trade unionism." This was the conclusion of the then chairman, Warren Madden, and of Edwin S. Smith. William M. Leiserson, the third member of the board, thought no complaint should have been issued. While the court would ignore any unfair labor practices which occurred after the agreement, Leiserson proposed to ignore those which happened before it. Without citing any evidence, he dismissed the Fahy discharge as the result of "internal differences in the union."

H. R. 1776

THE PURPOSE of H. R. 1776 is to enable the President to carry out the policy of all aid to Britain short of war with more effectiveness than is now possible. That policy is not the personal property of Mr. Roosevelt or of any party in this country. Repeated tests have proved that an overwhelming majority of the people endorse it. In the late election Mr. Willkie supported it as heartily as Mr. Roosevelt and, indeed, had he not done so he would have polled millions fewer votes.

Despite this evidence, the Republicans in Congress, with a number of honorable exceptions, are insisting on treating the Lease-Lend bill as a partisan measure, regardless of how much damage they may do to national unity in this time of crisis, regardless of the effects of their action in Europe. Mr. Willkie has been telling us that Britain's courage remains undaunted, but we must remember that one element in its morale is faith that America will not fail in supplying material aid. Blind to the risks involved, Republicans in Congress are missing no opportunity to indulge in misrepresentation and obstruction. While part of the Administration forces were lunching last Thursday, an amendment was slipped through giving Congress power to rescind at any time, by concurrent resolution, all and any powers assigned to the President under the bill. By smart tactics Representative Dirksen of Illinois, who proposed this amendment, hitched it to the one limiting the period of the bill to June 30, 1943—an amendment already accepted by the Democratic leadership. Thus the problem arises of how to remove the Dirksen amendment without at the same time sacrificing the time restriction clause.

An amendment, introduced by Hamilton Fish, to recommit the bill and substitute a simple credit to Britain of two billion dollars was defeated. But it may be brought forward again in the Senate by Senator Taft, who has also announced his intention of offering a string of amendments to the bill apparently designed to insure that aid to Britain will be "too little and too late." The supporters of the straight loan plan argue that the danger of providing additional powers to the President would be avoided and the British would be furnished with the means to continue their purchasing program on present lines. Congressional supporters of this plan have omitted to mention how welcome it would be to certain manufacturers who have been charging the British all that the traffic would bear. They do not like the bill because it means that future orders for Britain will be consolidated with those for our own defense forces and will therefore carry a lower rate of profit. But this is really one of the great advantages of the measure since it permits the smooth planning of procurement and also makes possible a standardization of armaments which will contribute to the economy and speed of our own program. Apart from these considerations, there is ground for questioning the motives of Messrs. Taft and Fish. We remember that in the fall of 1939 they both opposed lifting the arms embargo because, they argued, that would involve us in war. Now, they profess to favor arms for Britain and to be anxious to make loans to that country. Is this just a maneuver or does it represent a real change of heart and a confession of error in 1939?

With voting very largely following party lines, the bill went through the House with the inclusion of a new amendment placing a ceiling of $1,300,000 on the value of existing war equipment or that under appropriation which may be transferred to other governments. This ought to dispose of absurd accusations that the President could and would give away the whole navy.

We have little hope, though, that reasonable amendments will silence those irreconcilables who seem determined to use the Lease-Lend bill as a vehicle for attacks on both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie. Against the President they continue to hurl the accusations of attempted dictatorship, asserting that he hopes to use the bill both to put the country in the war and to seize control of private enterprise. If there were truth in the first charge, we might wonder why he should seek such means to accomplish this end when his existing powers as Commander-in-Chief gives him far broader authority. As for the control of industry, Congress has already granted him wide powers through the defense appropriations it has voted and in the Conscription Act. H.R. 1776 neither adds to nor subtracts from these powers.

In the election we vigorously opposed Wendell Willkie but we feel disgusted with the venomous onslaughts now being made on him by some of his erstwhile friends. His crime is that he has lived up to his promise of "loyal opposition" by giving general, although not unqualified, support to the Lease-Lend bill.

Two elements in the Republican Party are now out for his blood. The appeasers and isolationists, who supported him during the election because, as they candidly explained, they regarded his stand on foreign policy as mere vote-catching, now have the gall to accuse him of betrayal. They are joined by some of the party hacks, who have always resented him as an outsider and take the line that an opposition has no responsibility except to oppose. We believe both these elements to be far more widely represented among Republican office-holders, in and out of Congress, than among the twenty-two million voters who endorsed Mr. Willkie. Consequently, we do not fear the effects of Republican antics in relation to H.R. 1776 on the unity of the country: it is far more probable that they will shatter the ranks of the G. O. P.

The First Battle

BY FRANZ HOELLERING

THE FIRST BATTLE for the liberation of Europe was fought seven years ago this week. It was then for the first time that common people took up arms against the fascist onslaught. They were defeated, as were the Spaniards a few years later.

It happened in Austria. On February 11, 1934, the Minister of Police in the Dollfuss government made a speech. The occasion was the celebration of the Holy Field Mass after the Sunday maneuvers of the fascist Heimwehr—Mussolini's fifth column in Austria, led by Prince Starhemberg, the same man who marched with Hitler in 1923 and who today is allowed to wear and to dishonor the uniform of De Gaulle's Free French forces. The Minister of Police declared that he could not say much; he did say that Chancellor Dollfuss was now of one mind with the Heimwehr and that the Heimwehr would do a thorough job, beginning the next day.

The promise was kept. After a successful bloody provocation of workers in Linz, the capital of Upper Austria, in the early hours of the morning, the Dollfuss government declared martial law and dissolved the trade unions and the Socialist Party which in the last election had received 75 per cent of the vote in Vienna and 45 per cent of the vote of the country. The government arrested the Socialist leaders, dragging even the seventy-year-old mayor of Vienna into prison, and started a wholesale attack with tanks and cannon on the workers' quarters. By nightfall the *Schutzbund*, the defense organization of the workers, was fighting back. Outnumbered, insufficiently armed, and without leadership, they held out for three days and four nights. They knew they could not win, but they fought. "Hunger hurts," they argued against the appeasers," but we must resist injustice. Otherwise, we won't get anything to eat either."

Injustice! By this single word the workers of Austria understood in their own way the fascist ideology with which they found themselves confronted, after having built up over a period of more than thirty years the most advanced labor movement on earth. They had fought until then with "spiritual weapons," as their leaders liked to call the democratic processes. "One more election," many an Austrian worker thought, "and we'll have the majority in the country and take over the government and lead Austria on the way of peaceful progress, as we are already doing so successfully in the city of Vienna." Precisely this possibility and this conception of a dynamic democracy were the reasons why the workers of the Austrian republic had to be liquidated at a time when the ruling classes everywhere were still united in underestimating Hitler and in appeasing him by meeting him halfway, as they thought they were doing, with the glorious program: The status quo minus the Bill of Rights.

Today, to more and more people, this program seems like madness. It was then; but the semi-fascist Dollfuss believed in it and had the blessing of the Catholic Church which still believes in it, and everywhere the sympathy of the great press, which played him up as Little David defending his country against Goliath Hitler. The pretension was that Dollfuss represented the Austrian people and its freedom while he was dragging the most upright Austrians to the gallows. When the battle ended, on February 19, 1934, the New York *Times* wrote in an editorial: "Whatever form of government the Austrian people may decide to set up in Vienna is no concern of outsiders." As if the Austrian people had still any say about it! And as if G. E. R. Gedye, the most clear-sighted of the American correspondents in Vienna at the time, had not written the day before in the same paper: "While making the utmost of the Nazi danger, which instantly invoked the sympathy of foreign powers, the government actually always paltered with the Nazis while steadily preparing for the real objective—the destruction of democracy and socialism in Austria."

The destruction of democracy—or the building of democracy: this main issue of the present world conflict was clearly posed in the first battle in the February days of 1934. In the last analysis the poor tool Dollfuss and the whole Austrian people became the victims of Hitler because the ruling classes of France and England and the United States thought then, and for too long a time afterwards, that they could handle Hitler and Mussolini by throwing them a few crumbs—Ethiopia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. Democracy, of course, meant nothing more to them than a convenient method for keeping their privileges. How seriously they have changed their minds in the meantime and how many of them only for the duration will be an academic question when the last battle has been won by the *Schutzbund* of Engand.

Why Hitler Hesitates

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

AT no time since the war began has the future of Europe seemed more obscure than it seems today. For the moment Hitler's path seems blocked in several directions, but it is certain that this setback can only produce a more intense and terrible attack. Hitler cannot afford setbacks.

The only serious obstacle he faces is Britain; every other interference with his plans exists only because British resistance is still undiminished at home and because the British offensive in Africa rolls on without check. Undoubtedly Great Britain is now aroused to full determination. The drive against Mussolini will be pushed to the limit; no one who heard Churchill's bold report last Sunday can doubt his intention to crush to powder the Italian empire in Africa. The bombardment of Genoa by British ships was an act of tremendous significance, for it was a demonstration both of Britain's mastery of Mediterranean waters, even along the Italian coastline, and of its ability to attack Italy on its own soil.

It is British strength that gives Pétain and Franco and the Bulgarians and the Jugoslavs courage to resist, even for a time, the pressure Germany has put upon them. Newspaper reports hint that American diplomatic efforts are largely responsible for the stronger stand taken by Hitler's satellites. Relief supplies from the United States have reached Spain and unoccupied France, and it is rumored that the State Department has promised oil and equipment for Pétain's North African army in case it finds itself fighting against the Italians. The "moral embargo" against Russia was lifted as a gesture designed to encourage anti-Axis feeling. But if these tokens of appeasement should prove to be effective it will be only because they supplement the successful efforts of British arms.

Because Britain is fighting with undiminished courage and growing success, Pétain has in the past few days begun to be looked upon as a ruler rather than as a victim. The people in the street crossed themselves and prayed when he walked to church last Sunday. For the moment the unanimous hatred of the French people for the treasonable plotting of Laval finds expression in the old Marshal's resistance. By tomorrow this precarious interlude of French independence may be ended. The new Darlan government may give Hitler the substance of his demands, even if Laval is not forcibly installed as his agent. Or he may set Laval up as head of a separate cabinet at Paris, recognized by Germany as the valid government of France. He must take risks if he cannot win without, for time is against him. But his temporary defeat at Vichy this week will remain a British victory; a by-product of Britain's successful campaign on other fronts. So with Spain. Franco can afford a show of firmness in the face of Nazi demands only because Britain's success lends him a strength that he could never muster by himself. So, too, with Bulgaria. That poor country, stepchild in a miserable family, has lately been infested with Germans at a season when the Balkans are least likely to attract innocent tourists. At any time it may see the transformation of Teutonic salesmen and sightseers into the advance guards of a Nazi army. But for weeks Bulgaria has blocked the way to Greece and the Dardanelles, not because it is strong but because Britain is strong and British advances in Africa have encouraged Russia to encourage Bulgaria to resist.

In this train of events there is a lesson for America—and for Britain, too. An ounce of military power is worth a million tons of appeasement. And appeasement is worth less than nothing except when it is an adjunct of power.

But since Hitler is not defeated, and since he cannot tolerate even a temporary halt, these past days will certainly serve as a prelude to new and more terrible destruction. Hitler could afford to wait only if waiting weakened the enemy. The next weeks may or may not produce the attempted invasion which Churchill expects. It is true, as we said, that only a defeat of England would bring victory to the Nazis, but Britain might be dangerously weakened by successful attacks elsewhere. In spite of the weakness of his chief partner, Hitler may decide to move toward Gibraltar or the Dardanelles or both. If he makes these attempts he will have to abandon most of the pretenses which have hitherto smoothed his road in France and the Balkans; this much the events of recent weeks have accomplished. He will have to treat Italy as a protectorate. He will have to drive through Bulgaria and perhaps Jugoslavia, through France and Spain—using these countries as military highways. If they acquiesce in his invasion, it will be a surrender, not a collaboration.

The reluctance of the rulers is rooted in the feelings of the peoples, feeling which even dictators must regard with respect and apprehension. In France hatred and an energy of resistance have replaced the apathy that followed defeat. Italy is boiling with suppressed rebellion; every private report tells a story of growing resentment against a continued, hopeless war and the regime that is responsible for it. In Spain the unarmed but unanimous opposition of a hungry population would break out in open rebellion the moment a well-fed German army crossed the frontier. Hitler must move, even against a tide of popular resistance. The British, for their part, cannot afford to let this mood subside or to be crushed into despair; in the end, if they have the courage to use it, the anger of the people at the misery and oppression that characterizes Hitler's "new order" will prove their most powerful ally.

Belated Magna Carta

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, February 6

IT may be said, without much exaggeration, that so far as labor and the anti-trust laws are concerned, the Supreme Court is beginning to follow the 1912 election returns. One of the pledges made by President Wilson in that year was the enactment of legislation exempting labor from the anti-trust laws. The promise was kept in the Clayton Act, but although this was passed twenty-six years ago the Supreme Court didn't put it fully into effect until last Monday. When I say Clayton Act I mean those sections of the law which Samuel Gompers hailed as a labor Magna Carta.

Gompers spoke too soon, and I too may be a little hasty. A few years after the Gompers statement Chief Justice Taft deftly nullified that Magna Carta, interpreting it as "merely declaratory" of what had been the best practice always" and then applying it in accordance with what had been the worst. A few years from now further changes in the court may undermine or reverse the brave reasoning of Justice Frankfurter in the Hutcheson case. Four judges agreed with him that "Big Bill" Hutcheson of the Carpenters Union could not have been guilty of violating the anti-trust laws by calling a jurisdictional strike. But only three judges endorsed his reasoning and approved the principles he laid down for the future. These principles are the principles which most of the people of this country thought were enacted into law when the Clayton Act was passed in 1914. On these the court was splintered rather than merely divided, and the curious lineup may serve to warn Mr. Roosevelt that the New Liberalism of our highest bench is still too precariously established to permit the political luxury of appointing a Byrnes to succeed Justice McReynolds.

Justice Murphy took no part in the case, since it was begun when he was Attorney General. Justice Roberts and the Chief Justice, who dissented, belong to a generation of judges for whom the Clayton Act has been a kind of shadow statute, a legislative ghost easily laid by judicial incantation. Justice Stone, of the same generation but of a different temper and outlook, voted to uphold the lower court, which dismissed the Hutcheson indictment. But he could not bring himself to agree with Frankfurter's reasoning. Had the facts been but slightly different, Stone might have felt compelled, by past precedents, to cast a vote for Hutcheson's prosecution.

This leaves but four judges, Black, Reed, Douglas, and Frankfurter, who were prepared to give an unequivocal answer to the questions of policy raised by the Hutcheson case. The Clayton Act specified certain types of labor activities and disputes which were to be exempt from either injunction or criminal prosecution. These four judges might have overruled Taft's drastic limitation of this exemption, but there was an alternative. The Norris-La Guardia Act, which Frankfurter wrote, had already "reversed" the Taft decision by declaring specifically that jurisdictional disputes were to be exempt from injunction. In passing that act Congress made it clear it was correcting judicial misinterpretation of the Clayton Act. True, the Norris-La Guardia Act dealt only with injunctions, not with criminal prosecutions, but to Frankfurter and his three colleagues it seemed ridiculous to say that while the courts might not forbid jurisdictional strikes by injunction they could send men to jail for engaging in them. "Such legislation," they said, "must not be read in a spirit of mutilating narrowness." They threw out the Hutcheson indictment on the ground that Congress had shown its intent to exempt the jurisdictional strike from the anti-trust laws. Roberts and Hughes accused them of "usurping" the functions of Congress, but Frankfurter and his colleagues were merely applying Congressional intention instead of past judicial misinterpretation.

The importance of the Hutcheson decision does not lie in its legalization of the jurisdictional strike, a plague of which labor had best rid itself as quickly as it can. It lies in the fact that the Hutcheson decision makes more explicit the rule foreshadowed in the tangled compromises of Justice Stone's Apex decision. This is that labor activities are exempt from the anti-trust laws so long as they are not part of a combination with employer groups for the control of market prices. The establishment of this rule would sharply narrow the area in which Thurman Arnold has been trying to use the anti-trust laws against labor unions. Of the five types of "unreasonable restraints" outlined by Mr. Arnold in his famous letter of November, 1939, to the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, only one would still be subject to anti-trust prosecution. This is the case of combinations with employer groups "to enforce illegally fixed prices." By this rule the Supreme Court majority does not imply approval of the labor union practices criticized; it merely registers an intention to limit the anti-trust laws to actions against "trusts," which is how they were intended to be applied. And it recognizes the dangers to legitimate unionism of attempts to use the anti-trust laws as a means of policing the labor movement.

British Communists Help Hitler

BY HAROLD J. LASKI

London, January 20

JUST one week ago today a "People's Convention" was held in London. It was an enthusiastic meeting, attended by at least some fifteen hundred persons. It passed unanimously a series of resolutions calling for more air-raid protection, higher wages, democratization of the armed forces, the creation of a "people's government," freedom for India, and so on. It also established a working committee which is to organize the intensification of the aims the convention approved, by propaganda which shall bring together the "massed forces of the working-class."

The convention did not receive much publicity in Britain. But it has received interested approval on the German and Italian wireless; and *Pravda* has reported its main proceedings at length. It was, in fact, essentially Communist-inspired, and its whole effective operation was in Communist hands. While some of the speakers, notably Mr. D. N. Pritt, were not members of the Communist Party, all the principal speakers were of the true faith; and no speech was made which deviated seriously from the Communist "line." The chairman and majority of the Standing Orders Committee were Communists; the resolutions put to the conference coincide in itemized detail with the latest program of the Communist Party; and the main Communist speeches were so little the outcome of the discussion in the conference itself that they were, I gather, distributed in multigraphed form to the press while the discussions were proceeding. It was symptomatic of the habits of those who organized the conference that the "simple soldier" who addressed it (his name being withheld from the audience) was, in fact, one of the best-known Communist speakers in this country.

It is unquestionable that some of those who supported the conference do not belong to the Communist Party, either overtly or secretly; and some who did so would, as they have publicly said, withdraw their support if they believed that its purpose was "appeasement" in any shape or form. It is certain that many of the organizations represented in the convention sent delegates because on a number of matters they had real grievances to formulate and welcomed the chance of doing so. Some of those present, however, represented nothing at all. The workers, for example, in one aircraft factory protested that their shop stewards, who happened to be Communists, sent delegates to represent them without even a pretense at consultation. Other delegates went from organizations which were created simply for the purpose of doing Communist propaganda under another name. Others were picked at hole-and-corner meetings utterly unrepresentative of the bodies they were chosen to represent. Others, again, like the delegates from the South Wales miners, voted for resolutions which, when put to a full conference of the miners themselves, were rejected by a three to one majority. The local labor parties which sent representatives were in many cases bodies dominated by members who are believed to belong to the Communist Party but deny their membership even while they carefully follow the party "line."

It is, I think, worth while to analyze a little closely the policy which lies behind this latest alias of the Communist Party. For what was important in the convention was not the resolutions which dealt with immediate questions, but the demand for a "people's government," and the insistence that it must be brought into being by the massed effort of the workers. It is based on certain beliefs that Communist writings in recent months have made unmistakably clear. They are: (1) that this is an imperialist war; (2) that a victory of the Churchill government would be a victory for British imperialism and against the interests of the working-class, the world socialist movement, and the Soviet Union; (3) that everything possible must be done to destroy this government and replace it by one chosen by working-class organizations free from the taint of imperialism or of fascism; (4) that such a government would offer Germany a "people's peace," based on the principles of no annexations, no indemnities, and of self-determination for the conquered and occupied countries; (5) that the offer of this peace would probably provoke revolution against Hitler and Mussolini in Germany and Italy; (6) that failing this peace, the people's government could wage war on Germany, with the help of the Soviet Union, until the European socialist revolution swept over the continent.

This is, I think, a fair summary of what the British Communist Party is now preaching. I hardly need to point out that it is an adaptation to the present conflict of Lenin's famous slogan "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war." Its purpose, essentially, is the overthrow of the Churchill government. Since it is clear that this cannot be accomplished in the present Parliament, or at a general election (only one anti-war candidate has saved his deposit at any by-election since the war began), it must be accomplished by extra-parliamentary means. The

exponents of this policy must therefore look to civil war as their method. To promote it they must destroy the national unity by every means in their power: strikes, demonstrations, exploitation of grievances, permeation of the armed forces, etc., on the well-known Bolshevik model of 1917. If they were to succeed in this purpose, it is clear to any rational mind that the resultant confusion would give Hitler the one certain chance he possesses of successful invasion. From this, the conclusion follows that the Communists believe, in 1941 as in 1917, that defeat is the prelude to revolution in the defeated country and that revolution in the defeated country would be the signal for revolutionary uprisings in Germany and Italy against Hitler.

It is important to remember in this context (1) that the Russian revolution did not provoke any attempt at a revolution in Germany while the latter was undefeated; that came only after the rapid demoralization of the German army consequent on the defeats of July, 1918, and subsequently; (2) that had Germany not been defeated in 1918, it is at least improbable that the Bolshevik revolution would have survived; (3) that the defeat of France has not seen any movement toward a workers' revolution and that this is unlikely until the hold of Hitler upon France has been broken; (4) that no evidence exists of any willingness on the part of the Soviet Union to come to the assistance of the French workers, directly or indirectly. On the contrary, the months since the fall of France have seen the constant reiteration of its neutrality by the Soviet Union.

It is impossible not to conclude that either the British Communist Party is dwelling in cloud-cuckoo land or its purpose is to assist in the defeat of Great Britain. The second result, whatever its intentions, would be bound to follow if its present policy was in any serious degree successful. A wave of strikes which paralyzed British production; the growth, deliberately fostered, of unrest in the armed forces; the organized conduct of anti-war propaganda which involved deliberate stimulus to seditious conspiracy—all of these would obviously hamper our power to hold Hitler, and might do more than hamper it. If it led to our defeat, the spectacle of France does not suggest that there would be an opportunity for working-class revolution. On the contrary, it shows that we should become a tragic province of Hitler's dominion with no hope of revival for long years to come.

It is significant, I think, that in the literature issued to expound the principles of the People's Convention, as in the resolutions of the convention itself, while there is much talk of liberty and democracy and socialism, and of the Churchill government as the enemies of these, there is no mention of their greatest enemy in the world today—Hitler and Hitlerism. That is characteristic of all Communist propaganda since the famous volte-face of October, 1939. In the first month of the war the Communist Party had no doubt that Hitler must at all costs be defeated, even though it hated and distrusted the Chamberlain government. Since October, 1939, it has had little to say of, or against Hitler; all the artillery of its hate has been directed against Great Britain, which is now accused, in concert with the Roosevelt Administration, of looking eagerly toward a war against the Soviet Union.

What underlies this attitude? I cannot believe that the Communist Party really desires a Hitler victory. I can understand that it is disturbed at some of the policies of the Churchill government, notably its indefensible blindness over India. But to seek, as it is now seeking, its extra-parliamentary defeat, is clearly to court civil war; and, as I have said, a civil war here means a Hitler victory. For not even Mr. Dutt can believe that if Hitler struck, the Soviet Union would come to the assistance of a disorganized Britain. Not even Mr. Dutt can believe that Russia, granting a desire to help a revolutionary Britain, would be capable of doing so if Hitler decided simultaneously to attack the Soviet Union. In the light of Soviet experience in 1917-18, he cannot seriously believe (or, if he does, he cannot be taken as a serious observer of affairs) that a victorious Germany would accept from a Britain emerging from the confusion of revolution terms of peace which deprived it of all the fruits of her conquests. Certainly that acceptance is no more implicit in the terms imposed on France, or in the speeches of Nazi leaders, than it was explicit in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk twenty-two years ago.

What, then, explains the Communist attitude? It is, I think, due, essentially, to two causes. The first is the necessity of defending the position of the Soviet Union in this war. If it were to be accepted as a war against fascism, then the defense, not indeed of the neutrality of the Soviet Union, but of a neutrality largely benevolent to Germany, would be impossible. Its more obvious explanation—the fact that the Soviet leaders fear the effect of a major war on their experiment, and, hardly less, upon their personal control of the experiment—is not an explanation which easily fits Communist boasts of the impregnable strength of the Soviet Union. It is not easy to admit that the leadership in the fight against fascist dictatorship has, after all these years, passed from Moscow to London. It is therefore necessary for the Communists to maintain that this is no longer a war against fascism. To do otherwise is to reveal the weakness of the Soviet Union.

The second cause is more recondite. The Communist Party is assuming that with the end of the war there will be immense social problems causing profound discontent. This, it believes, will recoil upon the heads of the two major parties, and leave the way open for a third party

which not only predicted its coming, but opposed the war because it saw this condition as its conquence. The Labor Party, it believes, will be the main sufferer from this discontent, and the Communists will be able to take advantage of Labor's unpopularity to seize the leadership of the working-class forces in Great Britain.

This view is, of course, one that it is easy to see might well become a strongly founded one. If, at the close of the war, nothing has been made ready to grapple with the issues of reconstruction, there will be swift and condign punishment for the responsible leaders; and the main punishment will rightly be visited on the Labor Party, whose inescapable obligation it is to prepare now to meet problems it is possible to foresee, and for which there are clear and obvious remedies. The workers will not tolerate mass-unemployment and distressed areas after this war as they did after the last. They will not tolerate the continuance of the grave inequalities, in wealth, in housing, in education, in public health, which now deface our social system. They will expect gigantic plans to be ready for dealing with these matters; and a failure to deal with them may easily and, indeed, rapidly, produce a revolutionary situation in Great Britain.

I would add two things only. The Communists are not alone in their awareness of these dangers; the leaders of the Labor Party are equally alive to their imminence, and, if they were not, they would be constantly reminded of them by their experience at the party conferences which go on every week-end. Preparation to deal with these matters has long been in hand; and a strong team, under Mr. Greenwood, has just been appointed by the War Cabinet to lay down the general principles of post-war reconstruction. It is, no doubt, too early to say that we shall be able to carry through the task of reconstruction upon an agreed basis. It is not too early to say that the leaders of both great parties understand that without this agreed basis the dangers ahead will be enormous. Neither is it too early to insist that there has never been a time in our history when the whole people was so united in its recognition that large-scale experiment in matters of social constitution is imperative.

The second remark I would add is that no recognition of the difficulties we must face after the war can justify the risks the Communists are taking in their present policy. Were it to be successful, it would fasten the domination of Hitler upon Europe at least and possibly beyond. That is not a risk anyone is entitled to take who recognizes the meaning for the workers of a Hitler victory. It may be, of course, as one fellow-traveler has remarked to me, that the Communists have adopted this line because they know it will fail, but believe that, on this account, it will in the long run give them the best of both worlds. If this is indeed their view—as it may well be—it indicates a levity before the call of great events which is, I think, impossible to pardon. Men who can lie on the scale this attitude implies could not be charged with the destiny of any people without ultimately assisting in its betrayal.

Tax for Defense

BY MAXWELL S. STEWART

NOW that the Lease-Lend bill is past the hearing stage and well on the way to passage, Congress must face the even greater problem of determining how the defense program shall be financed. Although the issues involved are perhaps not so spectacular as those growing out of the President's proposal to lend war supplies to the democracies, they affect our daily lives even more fundamentally. For the decision will affect not only our pocketbooks, but, to a large extent, the kind of society we shall live in after the emergency has passed.

The very immensity of the problem may cause it to get less attention than it deserves. For years we have been hearing that the government was facing bankruptcy because of annual deficits of from two to four billion dollars. The deficit for 1941-42 has been estimated at nine billion! Unless drastic steps are taken, it will be even greater the following year. An expenditure of seventeen and a half billion dollars was authorized last year for defense. No one can foresee what the total will be this year, but domestic defense authorizations are expected to go above ten billions, and the cost of materials for Great Britain, Greece, and China may amount to half as much again. In the face of these amounts, lopping off a half billion dollars from the regular budget seems almost a futile gesture.

Congress has the choice of three ways of meeting the huge but necessary expenditures for defense. (1) It can decide to meet the defense costs primarily by borrowing. This would involve merely a continuation of the deficit financing used to pay the costs of recovery and relief during the past eight years. (2) It may permit some form of inflation and thus pay for defense by "new" money. (3) It may follow the President's injunction and, by increasing taxes, seek to put defense, so far as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis. Or, as it not unlikely, it may adopt some combination of these methods.

One thing is clear. Whatever method is adopted, we cannot dodge the full costs of the defense program. These costs are approximately the same regardless of the way they are financed. But the method of financing will determine who pays the bill and the nature of the problems which will face us after the emergency has passed.

Present indications are that the greater part of the costs of defense will be met, as were the costs of the first World War, by borrowing. We have become so accustomed to large-scale deficit financing during the depression that the huge sums at present required seem to cause little concern. But it cannot be too strongly emphasized that deficit financing for recovery and relief is very different from supporting the defense program by borrowed money.

During the depression a large portion of our manpower, factories, mines, transport equipment, and capital resources were idle because of lack of consumer purchasing power. The money which was borrowed for recovery and relief was used to provide jobs in constructive undertakings. Roads were improved, schools erected, airports built, new bridges constructed, and other useful work was done that added to the country's wealth. Consumer purchasing power was raised both directly through relief grants and indirectly through the stimulation of the construction industries. This, in turn, stimulated the entire economic process, creating real wealth as it did so.

Having just learned, with great difficulty, the laws of an economy of abundance, it is hard to adjust ourselves once again to an economy of scarcity. But we must recognize that the situation has been completely reversed. Our factories, mines, and transport facilities are, with a few exceptions, being strained to the limit. We still have unemployment, but it has been substantially reduced; skilled workers are at a premium in the defense industries. The money which is being spent on tanks, aircraft, guns, and warships adds substantially to consumer purchasing power, but it does not add to the country's wealth. Except where necessities such as food and housing are in question, we dare not utilize our resources to increase the number of things which people will buy with their greater purchasing power. On the contrary, some of the resources now utilized in producing goods for consumption may soon have to be diverted to imperative defense needs. Our national output is bound to suffer when men are taken away from their present jobs and given unproductive work in either defense industries or the armed forces. Yet these men will continue to consume, in some cases more than before, thus placing an increasing drain on our resources.

The creation of new purchasing power without a corresponding increase in the amount of goods available for purchase must of necessity result in a rise in prices. The reason that a considerable increase in prices has not already occurred is that we had huge unused resources when rearmament first got under way. During the first year of intense defense effort, we have done little more than take up the slack. But the pressure is beginning to be felt, and the coming months will see a tremendous stepping up of the defense effort.

The effect of large-scale government borrowing on this situation will depend largely on whether the money is predominantly obtained from individuals or, as is now the case, from banks. Money borrowed from individuals will have a much less inflationary effect than money borrowed from banks. For individuals have a choice between lending the money to the government or spending it on themselves. And every dollar they lend to the government will cut down the demand for consumers' goods, particularly luxuries. There is, however, a serious objection to financing the defense program primarily by borrowing from individuals, assuming that this could be done. Even a casual examination of the figures for accumulated savings by income classes will reveal that only the comparatively wealthy group can claim a substantial amount of savings. But if the wealthy buy most of the bonds, they will be in a favored position when the emergency is ended. The country as a whole will have to shoulder the burden of heavy taxation in order to repay them, and their descendants, for the "sacrifices" made for national defense. The British population has been laboring under just such a burden for the past twenty years because this method was chosen to finance the last war.

One of the gravest objections to financing defense by voluntary, interest-paying loans lies in the fact that it sets up a dual standard for wealth and human life. We do not hesitate to draft men for service in the armed forces, even though we know that some of them may be called upon to sacrifice their lives for their country. The draft board does attempt to invoke a doctrine of equality of sacrifice, or even of a proportionate sacrifice. It takes the strong, rejects the weak. The welfare of the nation comes before all other considerations. The dependence on voluntary loans invokes an altogether different standard, comparable to reliance on a voluntary, mercenary army enlisted on the promise of fat pensions for life. The existence of a double standard soon comes to be recognized by draftees and may seriously undermine morale.

To borrow from banks in order to avoid this danger is like jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. The money provided by the banks would be largely new money and would increase the amount of available purchasing power. The danger is particularly great because we have, as a result of devaluation, some billions of dollars of excess bank reserves which not only may be transformed into effective purchasing power but may serve as the basis for an even larger expansion of credit.

Since this new money cannot be balanced by a corresponding amount of new consumers' goods, we should soon have an unmanageable inflation on our hands. An inflation is both dangerous and unfair. For while the increasing cost of living imposes a heavy burden on workers, white-collar employees, and all others dependent on a fixed income, a favored few may benefit substantially. Business in general flourishes in a period of rising prices. A disproportionate amount of the national income would go to business men and shareholders, already a favored group. Speculators would reap an even bigger harvest. But the gravest objection to inflation, from the standpoint of national defense, is that it would discourage thrift and encourage needless expenditures for luxuries. For once inflation gets under way, people cannot be blamed for seeking to spend their money as soon as possible. As a result, we might be forced to adopt priorities, rationing, and other restrictions in order to maintain defense production.

The only practical alternative to borrowing is, of course, some form of taxation. Since in any event defense must be paid for out of current income, there is much to be said for drafting the money needed to finance defense instead of enlisting it on a voluntary basis. Few would deny that placing defense on a pay-as-you-go basis would involve the fewest headaches for the future. But it is usually assumed that this is wholly impossible.

Perhaps it is. But if so, the obstacles are political rather than economic. Given a sound system of taxation, there is no purely economic reason why the United States should not defray the costs of the present arms program out of taxation. Dr. Harold G. Moulton of the Brookings Institution has estimated that if the federal, state, and local governments took 25 per cent of a national income of $85,000,000,000, all our defense needs could be cared for. And he added that a 25-per-cent levy on a national income of $85,000,000,000 would be less burdensome than the 22 per cent actually taken by the federal, state, and local governments during 1938 out of a national income that was then only about $66,000,000,000.

Whether or not it is desirable to attempt to finance the defense program on a pay-as-you-go basis depends entirely on the kind of taxes levied. Obviously we do not want an increase of taxes that might impede the growth of defense industries or seriously undermine the health and strength of any part of our population. Taxes which increase business costs are dangerous because they are likely to be seized upon as a pretext for higher prices, and thus contribute to inflation.

Because no one likes to pay taxes, we may expect a sharp political controversy on the question of financing the defense program. Already the National Association of Manufacturers has indicated its advocacy of a general sales tax. Such a tax, it need hardly be said here, falls most heavily on those least able to pay. Families earning less than $1,500 usually spend their entire incomes, and therefore would bear the full brunt of it. The well-to-do, though spending more per family, relatively spend less, and, as a group, accumulate practically all of the country's savings. Although a sales tax would scarcely touch them, they would be caught by taxes on such luxuries as furs, liquor, new automobiles, and jewelry. Taxes of this type would also be useful in diverting to the defense industries labor and raw materials now expended in producing luxury goods.

But if we are to avoid injury to the health and efficiency of the low-income groups, it is evident that the bulk of the needed revenue will have to come from the so-called progressive taxes. The President has already indicated that the new taxation should be based on capacity to pay. And apart from some increase in inheritance taxes and a tightening in the gift-tax provisions, said to be recommended by the Treasury, the only important sources of new revenue available under this principle are the income tax and the excess-profits tax. Neither of these can be said in any sense to constitute a burden on production since they are levied only at the final stage after a profit has been made. It is true that some economists have argued in recent years that these taxes discourage new investment. But since it is in the interest of national defense to discourage investment in non-essential enterprises during the emergency, this has become an argument for rather than against progressive taxation. Special measures have already been taken to offset the effect of such taxes on investment in defense industries.

The political considerations affecting taxation are extremely elastic. In recent years it has been difficult to achieve even moderate increases in the income tax. In an emergency such as we now face some increase is inevitable, although it is doubtful whether it will be large enough to make much of a contribution toward putting defense costs on a pay-as-you-go basis. Some idea of the margin of maneuverability may be had by comparing the federal government's 4.4 per cent basic tax rate with Great Britain's basic rate of 42.5 per cent. If the American income and excess profits levies were raised to the British level, virtually the entire cost of national defense could be met without the need for additional new taxation. This is assuming the retention of the present exemptions of $800 for single persons and $2,000 for families. Reduction of these exemptions to the British level of $400 for single persons and $680 for married couples would yield several billion more.

No such increase in taxes is, of course, within the bounds of political realism. But it is important to know that the money is there if we choose to draft it. And although it may be utopian to speak of financing the defense program on a complete pay-as-you-go basis, the further we go in that direction, the milder will be our post-war headaches.

Spain in Prison

[The author of this article is a woman who was prominent in the socialist movement of her country. After the Hitler invasion she fled to France and, when the Nazi armies entered Paris, tried to get to Lisbon. She was arrested on the Spanish border and thrown into prison. Well acquainted with Spanish as a former teacher of Romance literature, she was able to come close to the prisoners and to write this vivid report of the present spirit of the Spanish people. Although she is now in this country, her identity cannot be revealed.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

I FIRST conceived this article as one that might be called "Prisons in Spain," but as I thought about it I saw that it had to be "Spain in Prison." According to figures given me by the most cautious Spaniards, between two and three million people are in prisons, work-battalions, and prison camps. The strongest impressions one gets are of immense hatred of the government, of the total insecurity and inefficiency of the rulers, and of a suppressed population suffering from famine and police persecution.

"All decent people are in prison," is a frequent consolation offered to old-fashioned women who are upset or ashamed on their arrival there. Certainly I never saw any criminals among the hundreds and hundreds of women in the prisons I lived in, unless those like the half-witted girl and the *gitana* (gipsy), both of whom had been caught stealing field corn for their starving families, are to be counted as such.

"Where are the criminals?" I asked in one ward, talking with a group of completely non-political factory girls, shop-assistants, and dancers. "Why, outside, of course! They govern us," was the quick reply of seventeen-year-old Remedios, busy arranging the curls of her friend Pilar.

In one of the prisons Concepión, a nice, bright-eyed, black-haired young woman, whom I had been teaching to spell and write her name, had to interrupt her lesson to take the daily walk. I stayed inside as a punishment for not having raised my arm high enough during the singing of the Franco hymn. When she returned, she was in tears. "My husband has been in prison since the civil war," she sobbed. "When my brother came home from France he was sent to a concentration camp as a welcome. My father has been arrested on the same false political charge as I. And this moment I've found my brother-in-law's nightshirt on the water-tap, where we prisoners wash our things! So he, too, is in prison, and he was the only one left to look after the children and the job." "But, my poor dear, perhaps it isn't his nightshirt; they all look alike, don't they"? "No, no. I recognized it; I embroidered his initials on it!"

Hay de todo (There are all sorts of people) can be said of prisoners too. All classes, all kinds, all types of Spaniards are represented within the grim walls. Well-to-do young women with smart frocks, embroidered lace-edged cushions, soft, warm blankets, and as much food as money can now provide in hungry Spain; stout middle-class women, bringing their own mattresses and stiff, old-fashioned white linen nightgowns; college instructors, schoolteachers, writers, physicians, midwives, people of high intellectual level and good political education; peasant women, illiterate and unwashed; ardent factory girls provided with bright lipsticks and even with small instruments for curling their eyelashes; dancers with high-heeled shoes, who never tire of responding to pleas for their wonderful jotas and tangos; young mothers with their babies. Yes, their babies. I saw a charming eighteen-months-old baby in one prison who had been born in another. The vagabonds of the *Lumpenproletariat* and the incomprehensible, curious tribe of the *gitanas* are represented too.

High or low, all of us were equal when it came to the prison soup. This is distributed at seven in the morning and seven at night, and is either too thick or too thin, and swimming with cooked peas and loathsome black noodles, or with rotten potatoes or a handful of rice, or a few green leaves, or, occasionally, cow bones. The women eat this disgusting dish out of their tin plates, as they walk slowly up and down a narrow corridor, not even stopping to sit on their cots: they are all hungry and want to get a second plateful the moment the last prisoner is served.

Most of the prison work—technical, administrative, and "cultural" is assigned to the prisoners themselves. They are made responsible for all office work except censorship—and in desperate cases even for that; they do the cooking and run the *Economato*, the "official" food store in which bad food is sold at high prices. They are also group-wardens (the outside watch is done by military guards), and, grossly hampered by lack of medicines, they are the physicians too, and must be careful not to insist on certain necessary medicines or diet food, lest they be put into the dark cell as nuisances. So they prefer to treat all diseases with cold water, hot water (when it is obtainable), and strong, cheap laxatives.

Spanish prisoners even write and edit a weekly, called

Redención (Redemption) because prisoners assigned to editorial work shorten their terms thereby. Certain privileges are granted to encourage subscriptions; for example, one more visiting day a month, if I remember rightly. But as every peseta is precious to those poor, even hungry people—it represents four sardines or four bananas or one hundred grams of almonds—not many copies to be found in the wards.

Redención is rather well written and edited; its articles and cartoons, though largely limited to sports subjects, are good; it is allowed to publish the British war communiqués (otherwise nobody would read it at all) after the German and Italian ones, but of course only as "freely" as the "free" papers in Spain. Naturally, it has space for official articles—an eight-column speech by the Señor General Prison Director, giving a rosy account of Spanish prison life, but insisting on the wholesome effect of capital punishment and warning his audience of prison officials not to be too tender toward the enemies of the state. In one copy I found a small news item: "Twenty prisoners have been shot in the presence of the whole prison population for planning (!) to escape by attacking prison guards."

Yet even without a *Redención* coming sometimes two weeks late, you may be sure that prisoners would quickly learn the news of the world and the war, and of Spain, especially anti-fascist news, from visitors, office-holding prisoners, and perhaps from guards. From time to time they may have to swallow some gross lie but on the whole they are in touch with the world.

Passionate discussions, hatred of the axis, fervent vows for England, deep disdain for the Franco government and its clerical backers are heard daily in prison—even from the mouths of politically uneducated women. They don't know that the Catholic Church in Spain, having given Franco full help, now feels cheated. In the prison churches (and perhaps in all churches), at the most solemn and mystical moment of the mass, when choirs and organ keep silent, the Franco hymn must be played; and at the end of the mass the prisoners must sing it—with outstretched arms.

Educated prisoners talk angrily of the schools the priests destroyed and of the spirit of hypocrisy they introduce everywhere; the factory girls indulge in fantastic dreams of vengeance. In a ward, where a picture of the crucified Christ hung on the wall, an old crumpled peasant woman walked up and down for hours in sulky silence, a kerchief drawn down low over her eyes. Suddenly she stopped in front of the picture and shook her bony fist threateningly at the Christ. A gloomy-looking, plump young woman stood up against the back wall on the evening she arrived in our overcrowded ward, took a rosary out of her pinafore pocket and summoned us all (we were already lying on our dirty mattresses) to pray with her or at least to give the responses. There were growing murmurs, protests, grumbling, until finally a fellow-prisoner went to her and said that the others did not want to pray, and that if they did, they had better do it silently with only their God to hear them.

All this hatred, all this obstinacy and violence in the Spanish people is an answer to the hatred, based on fear, with which the weak tyrants persecute them. *The civil war is not ended.* Nearly two years after the final surrender the slightest, most absurd political denunciation from *anyone* is still sufficient cause for imprisonment. Catalina, a pretty young dancer, was denounced as having worked for the Service of Military Investigation. This primitive creature had a fit of hysterical screaming when her fingerprints were taken on her arrival in prison. She thought it a magic way of executing people. The *abuelita* (little grandmother) with her snow-white hair, quietly knitting the whole day long, was accused of having helped her son escape to France. Whether or not such cases are passed on to the military tribunal, depends on mere chance; any rate the thousands of accused people spend months and years in prison before trial. The political sentences are savage, between five and fifteen years for women, up to thirty years for men.

The rulers' deep mistrust of the population shows everywhere, in prison and outside. Posters in all state offices tell everybody that it is as important to watch and disclose Free Masons, "the worst enemies of the state," as to die for the country. Everything free is feared: Free Masons, freethinkers, "You give the fascist salute when I enter the ward, but you are still a freethinker, aren't you?" shouted one prison officer to the sincere astonishment of the slender French girl he addressed. Is it not mistrust when a Spanish citizen cannot travel in Spain without a safe-conduct guaranteed by two members of the Falange? The Catalonian language, for example, is strictly prohibited, not only in the schools, but everywhere. Grim posters face you in every public building: "This is a Spanish office. Speak Spanish!" And yet near these same posters you can very often overhear a conversation between two officers—in Catalan! The wonderful popular dances and songs of Catalonia have been banned—but wherever in Spain I met Catalan women, young or old, I saw them dance and sing their sardanas.

I come to the end of this tale of my prison experiences. Just two last glimpses. It was evening—the last signal had been given for lights out and silence. But now and then, in the big darkened room a beam of light passed across a beautiful Murillo Madonna. It came from a flashlight in the hand of a woman busy searching her chemise for lice. You simply cannot avoid them, so you must catch them—a difficult job as they are nearly invisible. The evening before my release I was in a cell with five young women, nearly all of them political prisoners. I casually pronounce Del Vayo's name. I shall

never forget the excitement, the fear—for me and for themselves—the enthusiastic and burning remembrance.

Next morning I arrived in Madrid, free and eager to see "free Spain." First I went by subway from the station to the Puerta del Sol. The subway is decent, but in the staircase one can see, all along the steps, children sitting or lying in an incredible state of neglect, dirt, and indifference, wrapped up in filthy blankets, begging for *centavos*. Children are always the main victims of civil war, but in Spain you must add to prison and famine the incapacity of the government to deal with food distribution in an area which after all could be mastered if there were active interest and technical ability. In all the beautifully kept streets and avenues of Madrid are ragged small boys and girls selling useless little things, offering the latest lottery tickets, shouting at the top of their shrill voices, besieging every foodstore, coffeehouse, tearoom, *chocolateria*, asking the customers for pennies. Misery, famine, and abandonment. Near the station a group of escorted prisoners walk along. People watch them with profound sadness and comprehension. Spain in prison.

But all of them hope and are convinced of a change to come. Every morning in prison, after the monotonous three stanzas of the Franco hymn, which we had to sing standing in line, with outstretched right arms, came the fascist watchwords. *"España!"* shouted the underwarden. *"Una!"* replied the prisoners' chorus. The warden again: *"España!" "Grande!"* came the response. *"España!"* for the last time. *"Libre!"* rang out the answer, and surprisingly full and loud it sounded. Not a forced reply, but a menace, a promise.

Missouri Has No Governor

BY IRVING DILLIARD

St. Louis, February 6

MISSOURI has a new Governor and it hasn't. Forrest C. Donnell, Republican, was elected over Lawrence McDaniel, Democrat, last November, but the Democratic majority in the legislature, acting under the whiplash of the Democratic politicians, has prevented Donnell from taking his seat. He should have been inaugurated January 13. Now there is no telling when that ceremony will take place.

This attempt to steal the governorship—for that is exactly what it is—has aroused Missouri as nothing else in state affairs in memory of the oldest political observers. Nothing Boss Pendergast ever did provoked anything like the indignant public reaction. The crudity as well as the stupidity of the Democratic bosses who are responsible is nothing short of incredible. Instead of contesting Donnell's election, which they might well have done on the basis of his thin majority of 3,616 votes, they hit on a plan to keep him out of his seat first and then sustain that action by a partisan presentation of evidence, not from all the ballot boxes, but from such ballot boxes as a controlled legislative committee would decide to investigate. The result is that Lloyd C. Stark is staying on as Governor although his constitutionally limited four-year term has expired.

The background of the present situation begins with Governor Stark's fight on Pendergast. Many Missourians felt that Stark should be continued in the public service and so he became a candidate for the Senate seat, held by Harry S. Truman, a hand-picked choice of the Kansas City boss in 1934. But United States District Attorney Maurice M. Mulligan, who had prosecuted the Kansas City vote fraud cases so successfully, also wanted to be Senator. Ignoring pleas that he run for Governor and thus enable the Democratic ticket to present two boss killers, he ran against Stark and Truman in a three-cornered race for the senatorial nomination. The result was that Stark and Milligan divided the anti-machine vote and Truman was renominated in August and re-elected in November.

The Democratic nomination for Governor, which Milligan could have had, went to Lawrence McDaniel, a popular St. Louis lawyer. But honest doubts began to arise even before McDaniel was nominated. He was Excise Commissioner in St. Louis by appointment of the Democratic Mayor. He held the power of life and death over the liquor outlets. When he resolutely refused to resign as Excise Commissioner during his primary campaign, even after it was pointed out to him that his office had become relatively inactive against violators of liquor regulations, many people were convinced that the saloons and politics were tied up again.

McDaniel became the symbol of political bossism, transferred from Kansas City to St. Louis. His Republican opponent, on the other hand, was a symbol of precisely the opposite sort. An eminently respectable St. Louis lawyer, Donnell had not held public office before. In bar association activities he had been on the side of those seeking to improve professional standards and to better the name of the legal profession before the public. He sought to make the issue one of bossism, but in the excitement of the Roosevelt-Willkie campaign

not much attention was paid to the governorship race. Nevertheless, in county after county voters scratched their ballots to vote for Donnell. Conditions being what they were, Missourians felt that their combination of a New Deal President and a Republican governor was an altogether logical choice at the polls.

C. Marion Hulen, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, takes full responsibility for the plan to keep Donnell from his seat, but the fact remains that the state politicians by and large were apathetic until pressure was applied. Even then in many counties the committees failed to meet, let alone take action against Donnell. But when the legislature met early in January, its members were put through the paces by their bosses. St. Louis, for example, has twenty-five members in the two branches, and only one refused to go along with the plan to keep Donnell from the governorship.

The State Constitution makes the Speaker of the State House of Representatives the officer who must open and publish the returns on the governorship election before the legislature can proceed to other business. The Speaker, following Democratic orders, held up the returns, after which the Democratic majorities rammed through a joint resolution to "investigate" Donnell's election, meantime keeping him out of his seat.

A public outcry went up at once. St. Louis and Kansas City newspapers protested. As opinion came in from the rural press, it became clear that country editors, Democratic and Republican alike, were almost unanimously opposed.

Then came the bombshell that left the state stunned. Governor Stark appeared before the legislature to present his delayed valedictory, required by the constitution, and announced at the end, in a postscript, that he had vetoed the "investigation" resolution under his power to pass on all measures calling for the expenditure of state funds. Democratic Attorney General Roy McKittrick, who had already produced one opinion that the barring of Donnell was legal, forthwith ground out another saying Stark had no right to veto the resolution but that he had the power to pass on the appropriation of funds.

At this writing things are in a royal mess. The Democrats are trying to decide whether to start all over again or to go out and try to raise funds among themselves to carry on the "investigation" or to drop the whole business. Meantime, the legislature can't take up any appropriations out of the constitutional order, so that Missouri may soon be confronted with serious legislative questions involving payment of relief funds and the like. Governor Stark continues to sit and will until his constitutional successor takes over. Everyone agrees that nothing of importance in the way of state business can be transacted until the governorship tangle has been cleared away.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

Heresy in High Places

IT IS hardly news when the president of a great corporation makes a speech upholding the system of free enterprise; but it is news when he tells his audience that, if the system is to survive, it must justify itself by providing "total security," and goes on to outline a program which contains much of the essence of the New Deal.

For this reason I propose to discuss an address recently given before the American Institute of Electrical Engineers which, although adequately reported in the New York *Times*, seems to me to have attracted less attention than it deserves. Its author is Charles E. Wilson who after forty years with General Electric—he started as office boy—succeeded Gerard Swope as president of that corporation a little more than a year ago.

To the average business man, private enterprise is more than an economic system; it is a part of the moral order which, he believes, should be accepted with blind faith. Such a devout believer is shocked by a request for proof that the system works. Sure, he growls, it would work all right if only "that man" in Washington would give it a chance, and then he gives the usual tirade against the New Deal. For somehow the average business man has conveniently forgotten that the people chose the New Deal just because private enterprise *had* broken down in so many directions. And he fails to understand that the only adequate defense for the economic system he cherishes is a demonstrated capacity to produce and distribute the goods. No free people will long tolerate poverty in the midst of plenty.

The refreshing thing about Mr. Wilson's speech was that it recognized and attempted to meet this challenge. Its whole stress was on the opportunity and the obligation of the controllers of private enterprise to show that this system could provide "total security." Better still, it ignored that easy refuge for the perplexed business man—complaint against the government—and thrust aside the defeatism which is almost epidemic among business spokesmen at the present time. This defeatism takes the form of an assumption that the defense boom must inevitably be followed by complete economic collapse and that there is really nothing that can be done about it.

Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, believes that intelligent planning can carry us through the economic perils of both the current emergency and its aftermath. His program recognizes four stages, each requiring a special strategy. At the present time, he suggests, we are in a recovery stage which is likely to continue until the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production averages 140 over a two-month period. (In December it was about 136.) Until this milestone is passed we need to avoid restraints on employment and on expanding purchasing power. The development of new inventions and new products should be encouraged, rural electrification and industrialized farming should be promoted, and, finally, new sources of raw materials should be devel-

oped, by subsidy if necessary, in Latin American countries.

Next, according to Mr. Wilson, will come a "stabilization stage" during which we shall approach capacity production and must therefore take steps to keep a balance between the flow of purchasing power and the flow of goods and so avoid inflation. The maintenance of a full supply of non-durable goods must continue, but there should be credit controls to restrict long-term commitments on durable consumer goods and non-essential personal loans. At the same time modernization of all means of production, including utilities and transport, should be speeded up so as to make possible an increased supply of goods and services at less cost. At this stage, also, non-defense government activities should be gradually curtailed and a larger proportion of the budget covered by taxation. Economic development of Latin America should be extended, with efforts to promote industrial enterprise in the temperate zone.

After the Federal Reserve index has averaged 145 for two months Mr. Wilson thinks we shall have reached a "backlog-building stage" at which part of the demand for goods must be dammed up to provide a reservoir of unfilled non-essential wants ready to tap when diminished defense expenditure begins to check the rate of production. New restraints on consumer credit will now be required and, in addition, business investment for non-defense purposes should be checked. Personal and business savings should be encouraged and in this connection there should be increases in social security and unemployment insurance payments accompanied by extended coverage and benefits; medical and hospitalization insurance on a national scale should be provided for all unable to purchase such protection from private organizations; and, finally, there should again be increases in taxation and a drastic curtailment in government investments unconnected with defense.

To what heights he expects production to rise during this period Mr. Wilson does not say, but his fourth and last stage, during which "the free enterprise system will meet its most serious challenge," will be heralded by a *decline* in the industrial index to an average of 150 for two months. Now will be the time to promote consumption by every possible device. There must be more goods and more services for more people at less cost," and first of all there must be more and better housing. At the same time there must be intensified industrial modernization and conversion of surplus defense plants for the production of peacetime goods. Finally there must be permanent government public works.

The inclusion of this last item is an interesting tribute to the necessity for government intervention if a balanced economy is to be achieved, and I wish Mr. Wilson had been a little more expansive on this point. I should also like to see greater elaboration of his views on pricing policy. He appears to disagree with the theory held by most big industrialists that price maintenance is more important than production maintenance, but he does not tell us how, in a semi-monopolized economy, a more flexible price structure is to be established. Perhaps he should have included in his fourth stage a bigger appropriation for Thurman Arnold's sharpshooters.

However, the speech as a whole gives a forthright lead to business in looking forward instead of backward. And not to be overlooked is Mr. Wilson's insistence that private enterprise must accommodate itself to the democratically expressed wishes of the people. "An eternal essential," he says, is "universal respect for the rules which the people, through their freely chosen representatives, establish for the protection of their rights; which is, of course, only another way of saying universal respect for the sanctity and spirit of the laws of our land." Detroit papers please copy!

In the Wind

IN A STORY filed from Montreal on February 4, Pertinax, the French journalist, reported Laval as admitting that 90 per cent of France was not behind him. The original version of that story is somewhat different. Laval, in a talk with Göring, is said to have told the Marshal that he had the support of most of France in his anti-British, anti-Pétain stand. "Don't be foolish," Göring replied, "we know that over 90 per cent of France hates you and wants Britain to win."

SOCIETY NOTE: Jasper McLevy, Socialist Mayor of Bridgeport, has been entertaining Prince Otto von Hapsburg.

PRESS NOTES: A new left-wing magazine, *U. S. Week*, will appear on April 1. Published in Milwaukee and financed by the William E. Dodd foundation, its contributors will include William E. Dodd, Jr., son of the former Ambassador to Germany, Leo Huberman, Richard O. Boyer, Sophie Boyer, Marian Bachrach, and Doris Berger, daughter of the former Socialist Congressman from Wisconsin. . . . *Modern Industry*, edited by Harwood Merrill, will make its appearance at about the same time. It is expected to be a serious rival to *Fortune*.

SEQUEL: As was reported in *The Nation* two weeks ago, Roy Howard has threatened to "break" Willkie because of his vigorous support of aid to Britain. When advertisers complained to Howard about his attacks on Willkie, Howard is reported to have telephoned the former Republican candidate and said, "I know you wouldn't want to injure me." He then suggested that he and Mrs. Howard should see Willkie off on the Clipper and have their pictures taken together. Willkie refused.

ACCORDING to the Communists, every isolationist who is not a party member or a fellow-traveler is a concealed interventionist. When Colonel Lindbergh testified recently in Washington, the *Daily Worker* headlined the story, "Lindbergh Claims He Is Against Lend-Lease Bill."

D'ARCY COOPER, president of Unilever, Ltd., the great soap and margarine trust, and organizer of the Anglo-German Fellowship, has been in this country on a secret financial mission.

[*The $5 prize for the best item in January goes to Mr. R. S. of New York City for his story about General Franco and the State Department, published on January 11.*]

A Native at Large

BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Housing for Everyone

WHAT Mrs. Roosevelt said about the inadequacy of housing in the crowded defense towns made more impression on me, I think, because I read it on a rainy Sunday as the train moved in Alabama from Montgomery to Mobile. The fields were brown or gully-red. The ponds were alternately red and a rain-gray. But the cabins on the farms were all mule-brown, unpainted, and looked in the rain as if they were leaky and cracked for the wind.

As Mrs. Roosevelt told the Public Housing Conference, the situation is serious. The housing in many of the towns, where defense spending has congregated men eager for wages, is either wretched or a form of highway robbery in rents. These facts are not altered by the statement of Defense Housing Coordinator Charles Francis Palmer that sociology is not part of his job. They are not altered by the amusement of naval officers—broadcast from Norfolk by the Associated Press—over reports that many men in that area are sleeping three shifts to one bed, and that Hudson River steamers have been brought to Norfolk to provide living quarters for hundreds of families. There may have been cases of the "hot flop" bed rotation system, but not many, the officers thought. Negotiations to bring one Hudson River boat to Norfolk to house single men were under way but they had not yet brought the boat to town. It was needed, nevertheless.

Mrs. Roosevelt is right, as she so often is, but the tragic thing is that in so many of the crowded defense towns the housing is not much worse than normal housing the workers gladly left for the jobs and the pay. A queer thing, also, is that, in general, the housing seems the best in defense towns where there has been the most complaint and is certainly the worst where hardly any complaint has been heard at all. I know that some defense housing in industrial cities is bad. There has been crowding in them. Rents have gone up, and some of those who oppose defense housing projects are getting the higher rents. But such city housing is, at its worst, remarkably good beside that from which men in Mississippi and Maine, and other rural states, commute in jalopies to build new camps and new ships.

Defense has dramatically crowded the housing problem around its camps and essential plants. It is patriotically disturbing now to see such crowding. I wish all the winter travelers to increasingly pleasure-crowded Miami were required to go by the little town of Stark, Florida, which the construction of Camp Blanding has packed like a sort of civic sardine can. The crowding there, I think, would impress even those who travel so far to be part of a costlier Coney Island crowding on Miami Beach. But even then, I'm afraid, they might fail to see that bad housing is not so much a new and important aspect of defense as it is an old and sad aspect of democracy.

People who are suddenly concerned about the housing situation around the building of destroyers in Bath, Maine, cannot have seen the old, long-occupied houses on Maine farms with roofs sagging like the backbones of starving horses. Conditions around camps and powder factories in the South are bad. They have been bad for a long time. In one representative Southern county a study of the shelter of little farmers showed that one-third of the cabins have no window sashes, one-half no window panes. Two-thirds of them have leaky roofs. Only two out of every hundred of them have fly-proof privies—and the majority of these were recently erected by the WPA. Even the crowding is not new; it does not even seem deeply disturbing to those who share it or see it. (Sometimes it is "quaint.") The biggest families live in the poorest shelters in America. Poverty can crowd people into too little space as effectually as a national effort to create military power. And the school and hospital facilities available to most people in such housing have for years been worse than any deficiencies that defense's quick crowding may be expected to create anywhere now.

Perhaps as we prepare to defend democracy we must recognize that there is an absolute difference between the housing of defense and the housing of democracy itself. Undoubtedly in a push for production there is a relationship between the condition of the workers and the quality and the pace of their work. The most essential housing may be that nearest the most essential jobs. All that makes sense. But it should be recognized as a sort of American choice between guns and butter, as it is a choice between arms-plant people and just people who produce the less exciting things like fibers and food. Of course, America needs defense housing, swiftly and in volume, but this does not mean that a nation preparing to defend democracy can forget it needs—and lacks—housing for democracy too. Even at a time of preparation for total war the concept of decent housing for all the people should not be discarded.

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Friends of Dr. Johnson

JOHNSON WITHOUT BOSWELL. A Contemporary Portrait of Samuel Johnson. Edited by Hugh Kingsmill. Knopf. $2.50.

MR. KINGSMILL, author a few years ago of an entertaining popular biography of Samuel Johnson, has here the happy idea of collecting into one volume the most illuminating and amusing anecdotes of the Doctor not recounted by Boswell. Little or none of the material is, to be sure, either new or even particularly inaccessible, but Mr. Kingsmill has arranged it well, in chronological order and with the briefest of annotations, to make a delightful book.

Much has of course been written concerning the extent to which Boswell's portrait is accurate and complete, and Boswell himself has been represented as everything from a transparent fool whose own nullity enabled him to transmit a perfectly literal image, to a consummate artist who created the accepted image of Johnson by skilfully synthesizing selected elements into a predetermined pattern. "Johnson Without Boswell" inevitably suggests again the questions at issue and confirms what has always seemed evident to me, namely, that there is little difficulty in harmonizing the various accounts of Johnson, provided only the bare minimum of allowance is made for differences in temperament between the various reporters. Mrs. Piozzi, Fanny Burney, Anna Seward, and the others naturally saw Johnson through their own temperaments; moreover, each made him a slightly different person by her very presence. But the differences are surprisingly slight rather than surprisingly great. He was a little gayer, a little more worldly with Mrs. Piozzi, a trifle kittenish when conversing with that devilishly clever little snob Fanny Burney. But he is recognizably the same man, and even the account of his conversation with the Quaker lady—given by the notoriously unfriendly Anna Seward and probably the most unattractive item in the whole long list of Johnsoniana—is not unbelievable.

Only one important element in the coloring which Boswell gives seems to me to have been perhaps insufficiently allowed for. Bozzy was a furious rake and an amateur of piquant personal relationships. Because he was tickled to think that he was a chosen intimate of The Great Moralist he plays the situation up by emphasizing and perhaps overemphasizing the extent to which Johnson was most Johnson in moments of moralizing pontification, and he tends to underemphasize, not perhaps the great man's wit, but at least his superb sense of fun. Everybody knows the phrase from "Rasselas" which declares that "The remedy for the ills of life is palliative, rather than radical"; but it is a mistake not to realize that Johnson, who was no ascetic and no puritan, believed almost as much in the effectiveness of the palliatives as he did in the radical misery of life. Fun and food came high, next perhaps to literature, in the list of those things which made existence endurable.

Characteristically, it is in Mrs. Piozzi, not in Boswell, that one finds the reply, reprinted by Mr. Kingsmill, which Johnson made to the friend who feared that confinement for a mental disorder would undermine the general health of Christopher Smart by depriving him of exercise: "Exercise! I never heard that he used any: he might, for aught I know, walk *to* the alehouse; but I believe he was always *carried* home again." And it was also Mrs. Piozzi who told the story of the new-rich young man who came to Johnson to ask how he might add a suitable amount of learning to his other accomplishments. The talk turned upon natural history and upon the distinction between oviparous and vivaparous animals. "And the cat here, Sir," asked the young man about to devote himself to knowledge, "pray in which class is she?" "You would do well," replied the doctor, "to look for some person who would be always about you, Sir, who is capable of explaining such matters, and not come to us to know whether the cat lays eggs or not: get a discreet man to keep you company, there are many who would be glad of your table and fifty pounds a year."

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Gladiatorial

ARENA. By Hallie Flanagan. Duell, Sloan and Pearce. $3.

HALLIE FLANAGAN'S Federal Theater Project, as her scenario-record of it now makes a matter of exciting fact, was a central and dominant experience in modern theater history. It was the most extensive use ever made in this country—and possibly in the world—of the theater as an instrument of social therapy and public education. And by its free play through every existing kind of American theater, much of it on the most experimental fronts, the project pushed forward noticeably the development of theater forms and the rewelding of the theater arts.

The work-relief philosophy which fostered the project implied, of course, and aimed at just such a two-fold accomplishment. The primary tenet of that belief is that wages paid a man for doing his chosen work are a more economical expenditure than hand-outs of demoralizing home-dole. A close corollary is that the end-product of his work will be of value in itself. It was not too hard to find engineers and production experts who could do this two-horse riding: give first attention to employment-rehabilitation of workers and also manage to produce a good viaduct, housing unit, tin of beef, or quilt. But in this country where pioneer distrust and Puritan clucking do not yet see the theater as a normal part of life (and indeed finally would not accept the Theater Project as part of the Works Program) Hallie Flanagan's directorship seems like a miracle: a profound social sensibility running always beside an acute artistic consciousness, a double vision which was matched with a double ability to actualize. But then, such miracles occurred so frequently in the first years of the New Deal that they seemed almost to be a part of calculated government planning.

The Theater, along with the Music, Art, and Writers' Projects, came into being in the summer of 1935. Mrs. Flanagan's first arena was Washington during that torrid carnival of red-tape confetti. As I remember, it took Roman fortitude just to get through an order for an electric fan. But here she set up the United States government in show business, employed a cast of ten thousand in forty-eight states, put on a children's-Negro-Yiddish-religious-vaudeville-circus-puppet-dance-radio-drama, which ran for four years, entertained one-fifth of the country's whole population, and showed a profit. As a Guggenheim student of Europe's social theaters, she knew all the answers there were; but in this job you wrote, learned, taught the instruction-book as you went, each day, every day. Based on a belief in the rooted growth of regional theaters like Pennsylvania's Hedgerow, North Carolina's Playmakers, the Cleveland and Pasadena Playhouses, the WPA plan created a network of central theater projects throughout the country, each serving as a capital for its whole section or state. From time to time national productions—"It Can't Happen Here," "One-Third of a Nation"—cut across and united the work of these units. One indication of how well they worked, if such demonstration were needed, is that before their close in 1939, 2,600 theater workers had been returned to the commercial theater.

"Other colonists will come," writes Mrs. Flanagan in the face of that needless, gigantically wasteful, criminally ignorant Congressional action which terminated the Federal Theater. To such colonists—and that means all future American theater-people—she names as the project's greatest bequests: the discovery of a vast new audience who want theater; the decentralization, away from Broadway, into small indigenous units; the forging of a *means* of understanding and communication for almost every element in our population. "Such a theater," she says, "is the necessarily many-voiced speaking of democracy—an illustration and bulwark of it—this democracy which is never won but has always to be won."

The stage itself was Mrs. Flanagan's second arena. Here that taste which had distinguished the work of the Vassar Experimental Theater, again exercised its strength, though mostly from the wings and aisles. More than mere "good" taste, Mrs. Flanagan's is a perceptive intelligence of the "terrifying implications," the explosive change that touches every part of living now—and the conviction that the theater must grow up to reflect this or rightly dwindle into a museum piece. The Federal Project revived widely those matrices of theater energy—vaudeville, circus, and spectacle. Productions of the best classical and modern plays were "rethought rather than remembered"; and the still tentative poets', dancers', and radio dramas had more serious reading and frequent trial than ever before. Orson Welles worked out his streamline technique on a WPA Harlem "Macbeth," a "Faustus." That new montage of theater devices, the Living Newspaper, through various editions evolved a theater form which in Mrs. Flanagan's opinion and that of many critics is the most considerable discovery of this century, capable of a rich development.

Humorous and informed, "Arena" reads more like a playscript than a government report. In the deep sense of the words, the project was theater: mess of raw material; giant obstacles of temperament, opposition, inertia; the slow, slow shaping to the action-line seen only in the director's imagination; and finally the running vehicle, the show, the thing—and its curtain. Through it all emerges Mrs. Flanagan as a figure active in every one of the forty-odd situations she quotes on the title-page as synonymous with "arena": platform, hippodrome, playground, battle-field, airport, no man's land, scene of action, theater. In 1921 Yeats wrote to Lady Gregory that he had given the Irish people a theater, but in so doing he had missed finding his own ideal poet's theater. For Mrs. Flanagan no such division exists. Her notion of the theater is the ancient one; theater and life make one, create and reflect each other. Because "Arena" shows this truth and this person, as well as for its bank of facts, it will become, surely, the first handbook of the national American theater.

SHERMAN CONRAD

Over the Burma Road

INTO CHINA. By Eileen Bigland. The Macmillan Company. $3.

MRS. BIGLAND was the first Western woman to travel into free China over the Burma Road. If this does not sound like the basis for an absorbing book, it is only because no one who has not made the trip or read of it can imagine the primitive hardships, the danger, the sordid adventures encountered on the journey. Mrs. Bigland made it early in 1939. Not only was the road not really completed but she traveled it in the middle of the rainy season which added not a little to her trials. As a result, a trip which is supposed to take three or four days took her more than a fortnight. Although she started in a brand-new bus, breakdowns were too numerous to count. On several occasions she and her party were detained three or four days in frontier villages, without accommodations and practically without food. They were delayed by landslides, by breakdowns, and by sickness. A number of the trucks and buses in her convoy never got through. Some were swallowed in the deep gorges along the edge of the slippery, muddy highway. The remainder simply broke down, and there were no tools to fix them.

A substantial part of the trip was through the fever belt. In some of the villages almost the entire population seemed to be down with malignant malaria. Along the road her party encountered twelve engineers who had lain for eight days in an open, broken-down truck. All twelve were desperately ill. They were taken aboard the bus, but only four of them survived the long trip over the mountains to the nearest hospital. Several other fever victims were picked up from time to time, but few survived. The dead were pushed overboard into the nearest ravine. Social and economic conditions in many of the villages were as wretched as health conditions. Few more poignant stories of human misery have been penned than this picture of the situation in these remote villages on the frontier of China—villages that combine all the horrors of ghost towns of an ancient civilization and of boom towns of a modern war.

Perhaps because of this abnormal introduction to China, Mrs. Bigland, throughout the book, pictures the country as a

never-ending series of contrasts between the sublime and the sordid. She is enthralled by its magnificent vistas, its architecture, and, above all, by the philosophy and basic humanity of the Chinese. But at the same time she records more ugliness, more cruelty, exploitation, and plain stupidity than any other writer on modern China. There can be no doubt of her sincerity or of the essential accuracy of her observation. But there are times when she seems to be using contrast as a somewhat artificial literary device to enhance, quite unnecessarily, the reader's interest. The result is not wholly fair to China.

Only a person who has made the trip on the Burma Road in the rainy season can testify as to the accuracy and balance of this part of her story, but it bears all the earmarks of authenticity and is as absorbing a tale as has ever been told by a modern traveler. But when it comes to China proper, where she remained only a few days, Mrs. Bigland is betrayed into making certain generalizations which are patently untrue. For example, she tells a lurid tale of a rat being tortured by a street entertainer while "the crowd swayed and shouted in ecstasy." She quotes an old-time foreign resident as saying that this "is the favorite street corner entertainment in China." This reviewer is not prepared to say that the incident did not occur, but in his own six years of experience in China, mostly in the interior, he encountered nothing of the sort. The same is true of other gruesome incidents which are presented as typical of China.

Shortcomings of this kind are to be expected in a travel book, and are more than offset by the vividness which can be contributed only by the newcomer to a country. And despite criticisms that at times seem unfair, there can be no doubt that Mrs. Bigland is intensely sympathetic with China in its life-and-death struggle against Japan. Her story is not a pretty one, but it is essentially a true one and is of absorbing interest.

MAXWELL S. STEWART

A Georgian Poet

POEMS 1930-1940. By Edmund Blunden. The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

IT HAS been said of the Georgian poets that they turned to the countryside for subjects because, with their limited poetic equipment, there was nowhere else for them to go. But it might also be thought that by an unconscious premonition they went to find the one England they could love, before they were called on to defend all England. Of these, Edmund Blunden was one of the best, for he was, beyond any possibility of choice, a pastoral poet. His first poems appeared in 1914; his present poems are like a recollection of that time. Since then the English countryside has diminished and, if now threatened by another war, has never for the poet ceased to be haunted by the dead battalions of the last war. But if his poems are haunted, they are not haunting; they are mild and comforting, not exhilarating. They are well made, but the freshness that once pervaded them has somehow gone. The volume might very properly have been brought to a close by the elegy on King George V. For it is, even though only now published, Georgian poetry.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP

BARGAINS in BOOKS

UP TO **75% OFF** FORMER PRICES

Offered by America's Oldest Mail-Order Book House

ORIGINAL EDITIONS—NOT REPRINTS

1. AMERICAN INDIAN MYTHOLOGY. North American Mythology. By H. B. Alexander. *Profusely illus.* Archaeological Inst. 1930. A very thorough and most authentic study of the beliefs, myths, etc., of the *Indian* tribes of N. America. *Our special price.* **$3.88**

2. AUDUBON'S BIRDS. Each box contains *50 magnificent full-color reproductions*, 9⅜" x 12¾", of American birds painted by Audubon. Grouped by a famous Ornithologist into their various localities. *Each box of 50 color prints, for only* **$2.98**

Here is your opportunity to get the famous Audubon color prints of the birds in *your* vicinity.

(A) Atlantic Coast (Water Fowl and Shore Birds). (B) California. (C) Canada. (D) Florida. (E) The Great Plains (Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, So. Dakota, No. Dakota). (F) Illinois. (G) Indiana. (H) Kentucky and Tennessee. (I) Maryland. (J) Mexico. (K) Michigan. (L) Minnesota. (M) Missouri. (N) New England. (O) New Jersey. (P) New York. (Q) Ohio. (R) Pacific Coast (Water Fowl and Shore Birds). (S) Pennsylvania. (T) The Rocky Mountains. (U) The South. (V) Texas. (W) Virginia. (X) Washington and Oregon. (Y) Wisconsin. Order the collections that are nearest to where you live. Be sure to specify sections wanted. *Ideal for framing.*

3. RUBAIYAT OF OMAR KHAYYAM. Rendered into English verse by Edward Fitzgerald. Profusely illustrated with *magnificent full-color plates* by the famous Persian artist, Hamzeh Abdullah Kar. hand-mounted and *ready for framing.* Bound in full levant grained fabricoid. Boxed. ($10.00). **$1.98**

4. THE VIOLINIST'S MUSIC SHELF. The famous 8 vol. library of the *World's Greatest Music* (for the violin) from Bach through Beethoven, Mozart, Chopin, etc., to Tschaikowsky. 339 most important compositions of all time, practically the entire standard repertoire of violin music. Piano accompaniment included. *Over 2,000 pages.* Standard sheet music size, 9" x 12". Semi-stiff binding. Harcourt, 1937-'34. ($20.00) but having a sheet music value of over $200.00. *The 8 vol. set,* **$8.89**

5. GOULD'S HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY Throughout the World. With over *450 interesting illus.* 8¼" x 11". In 6 vols. "The story of Masonry throughout the world, since its earliest days, is one of the most fascinating narratives ever written." ($49.00). *The 6 vol. set, for* **$17.88**

6. THE PIANIST'S MUSIC SHELF. The famous library of the World's Great Music (for the piano) from Bach through Beethoven, Mozart, Chopin, etc., to Tschaikowsky. *300* most important compositions of all time, practically the entire standard repertoire of piano music. Over *1,200* pages. Standard sheet music, size 9" x 12". Semi-stiff binding. Harcourt, 1937-'34. ($15.00) but having a sheet music value of over *$150.00.* *The 6 vol. set,* **$6.88**

7. ELBERT HUBBARD'S LITTLE JOURNEYS to the Homes of the Great. In 14 illustrated volumes. Size 6¼" x 8⅝". Containing *189* brief biographies of the *most famous lives ever lived.* One of the most popular sets ever published in America. (Formerly sold by subscription only at $80.00.) *The 14-volume set Only* **$14.88**

8. FAMOUS VAN GOGH PAINTINGS IN FULL COLOR. Zuave—Still Life—Cornfield—Blooming Apple Orchard. Four famous Van Goghs beautifully reproduced in *full color.* Ideal for framing—they look like *original oil paintings.* ($10.00) *Our special price for all.* **$1.98**

9. ELLEN TERRY and BERNARD SHAW. Edited by C. St. John. *1st* edition, limited to *3,000* numbered copies, 6½" x 10¼". Boxed. Putnam. "The outstanding literary sensation of recent years." "Ellen Terry emerges amazingly as the best woman letter-writer in the language." *—Saturday Review.* ($30.00) *Only* **$3.88**

10. CURRIER AND IVES COLOR PRINTS. Magnificent lithograph reproductions in *full color.* Measure up to 13⅜" x 18". "When framed they look just like the originals which fetch hundreds of dollars at art auctions." ($10.00) *The 12 prints, only* **$1.49**

11. THE ART OF MARRIAGE. By J. F. Hayden, B.Sc. Extensive, frank, complete, this book includes notable chapters on unequalized sexuality, frigidity of wives, sexual satiety, prematurity, lack of art in procedure, impotence, prudery, etc. Also contains the fullest treatise on Frigidity that can be found today, as well as on Reservatus. *Illustrated, Revised, Enlarged.* ($2.50). **69c.**

THE UNION LIBRARY ASSOCIATION N-34

Established 1884

121-123 East 24th Street, New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen: I enclose $..... for which please send me the items I have encircled below, delivery charges prepaid.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

(Mark circle around items desired)

☐ Please send me FREE Catalog No. 318-N, containing hundreds of equally unusual Book Bargains—just off the press!

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... *State* .....

Banking: Two Views

MONEY IN MOTION: THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF BANKING. By Arthur C. Holden. Harper & Brothers. $2.50.

THE SEARCH FOR FINANCIAL SECURITY. By Robert B. Warren. Columbia University Press. $1.25.

THESE two recent semi-popular works on banking cover different ground from different points of view. Mr. Holden, an architect by profession, is primarily interested in banking reform as a method of raising and stabilizing the level of economic activity; while Professor Warren has "undertaken to explain the recent changes in our money and banking system in terms of the word 'security'." It may be remarked parenthetically that some of Mr. Holden's comments about the present status and importance of the banker suffer from a failure to take adequate account of the very changes which Professor Warren places in the forefront of his analysis.

Mr. Holden appears to have no doubt that the root cause of our economic troubles is to be found in a faulty *mechanism* for financing long-term investments. If I understand his argument correctly, he believes that there are two chief weaknesses in this mechanism: (1) it maintains the cost of long-term capital at too high a level; and (2) it does not assure a strict relationship between repayment of principle and the using up of physical assets. The result is that despite relatively high carrying charges, society's debt burden tends to grow cumulatively and in such a way as to constitute a chronic threat to economic stability. The remedy advocated envisages the establishment of a capital reserve system to occupy a position in the long-term field analagous to that now occupied by the federal reserve system in the short-term field. Its functions would be to bring down the level and reshape the structure of long-term interest rates on the one hand, and to introduce sound practices with respect to amortization on the other. The plan, as Mr. Holden recognizes, has a great deal in common with the proposal for a new system of capital credit banks which was laid before the Temporary National Economic Committee by A. A. Berle, Jr., and which enjoys considerable favor in certain quarters in Washington.

As this brief summary indicates, Mr. Holden confines his attention almost exclusively to the terms on which long-term capital is made available for investment purposes. Therein lies the weakness of both analysis and proposed remedy. When the economic problems of the last decade are considered in their true historical perspective, it seems pretty clear that the distinguishing feature of this period has been a serious dearth of opportunities for profitable investment, or, in other words, a stagnant *demand* for capital. There is unfortunately no reason to suppose that reform of our financial machinery would make a significant contribution to the solution of this problem. That Mr. Holden ignores this difficulty altogether is no accident. His economic theorizing never gets beyond the realm of the circulation of commodities and the technical role of money and credit therein. Nowhere does he press through to the underlying relations of production, the determinants of wages and profits, the relationship between aggregate consumption and aggregate investment, etc. Under the circumstances it is only to be expected that his proposals for reform, though interesting and intelligent in themselves, fail to touch upon the basic economic issues of modern society.

Professor Warren has performed a useful service in tracing the changing nature of the functions of the banking system in the period since 1914. Before the first World War the function of a bank was largely the financing of commercial transactions. Since then, however, the bank has become increasingly dependent, directly and indirectly, on bonds and stocks and hence on the security markets. With the virtual stoppage of new corporate issues in the 1930's, the banks have been obliged to turn more and more toward the federal government until today, as Professor Warren says, "the business of banking is the financing of the United States Treasury." This is an extremely interesting development with important implications for the whole structure of our economy. In the book before us, however, Professor Warren has limited himself to one small aspect of the problem, namely, its significance for the solvency of the banking system and the security of the depositor. In these two respects he seems to think, and probably correctly, that all foreseeable dangers have been fully guarded against. One may hope that in the future he will return to the more general issues which his treatment inevitably suggests.

PAUL M. SWEEZY

Don't Miss An Issue!

To keep THE NATION coming regularly

just fill out and sign this form

THE NATION • 55 FIFTH AVE. • NEW YORK

Please enter my subscription for the period indicated below. I inclose $.....

☐ One Year $5

☐ Two Years $8

☐ Three Years $11

Special Introductory Offer to new subscribers only

☐ 13 Weeks $1

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....

2-15-41

Extra postage per year: Foreign and Canadian, $1.00

Genghis Khan

THE EARTH IS THE LORD'S. By Taylor Caldwell. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.75.

THE indefatigable author of "Dynasty of Death" and "The Eagles Gather" has written another long novel about ruthless schemers and conquerors, but for the munitions-making Bouchards she has substituted the Mongol scourge Temujin, who became Genghis Khan, and the semi-legendary Prester John, whom she depicts as a wily, cowardly, conscienceless scoundrel.

In spite of a needlessly lush style, a lot of pseudo-archaic dialogue that does not always ring true, and a great deal of melodramatic intrigue with motives that sound complex but are really oversimplified, the narrative has a barbaric rush and verve; and from its many unflinching accounts of gruesome battle scenes and murders you would never guess that the author is a woman. Furthermore, in Temujin's lust for power and conquest, and his worship of relentless force, you are obviously supposed to recognize the morbid psychology of the dictator-complex—though, as the writer protests in a coy little disclaimer, "any resemblance between the characters of this novel and personages living today is indignantly denied by the author! Ghost of Genghis Khan should notify author of such libelous rumor begins to circulate."

LOUIS B. SALOMON

Photographs of New York

ROBIN CARSON, part-English, part-Spanish photographer, is not one of your manufacturers of "stunning" prints, but a quick, bold, bitter observer whose camera records vivid personal perceptions. Some of his studies rank with the photography most alertly and trenchantly descriptive of New York. Their energetic lines, marks, shapes, and hues are wonderfully graphic; their caustic and incisive comment reveals, along with the appearance of the city, some of the very quality and nature of its life. Especially gratifying is his capacity to project inner states through movement, through well-articulated motions of heads. His pictures lack fine print quality and imaginativeness—certainly his black and white design at best is less than original and is sometimes neglected—yet one cannot refrain from thinking of them in connection with the outstanding camera studies of Manhattan types such as those of Baron de Meyer and the young Paul Strand. It's the decadent contemporary New York —course, shoddy, dull, half worn out in its very lubriciousness—that Carson mainly depicts. The feeling he most frequently projects is that of inadequacy, the outcrop of unemployment even more than of inefficiency. This is but to say that his experience is pretty much everyone's today. His little exhibition current at the New School for Social Research is a must: it includes, along with a half-dozen sculpturesque studies of artists' heads, some of his liveliest New York photographs—West Forty-second Street, elegant Fifth Avenue; Sixth Avenue of the employment agencies; sidewalks of Little Puerto Rico and the East Side; theaters and night clubs, and their types and typical incidents.

PAUL ROSENFELD

Lafayette *Overture*

15-TUBE RADIO PHONOGRAPH *with* GARRARD RECORD CHANGER

$245

To you who will not accept second-best, Lafayette is proud to offer this masterpiece. An outstanding achievement in modern custom-built radio, the Overture will be just as modern tomorrow, for it gives you every known advance in high-fidelity broadcast and record reproduction — in a beautiful English Regency console, styled in rare hand-rubbed mahogany. We invite you to see and hear the Overture at your Lafayette showroom, or write for a detailed illustrated description.

Lafayette Radio

100 SIXTH AVENUE • NEW YORK, N. Y.
901 W. JACKSON BLVD., CHICAGO • 265 PEACHTREE ST., ATLANTA
110 FEDERAL ST., BOSTON • 24 CENTRAL AVE., NEWARK
542 E. FORDHAM RD., BRONX • 90-08 166th ST., JAMAICA, L. I.

To Beat Hitler—

WHAT DOES BRITAIN NEED?

FIVE FOLD AID TO BRITAIN

. . . to save her and keep us out of war

By FRITZ STERNBERG

DO YOU KNOW Germany is exacting more planes, steel and goods from conquered Europe than we are sending England?

Most Americans agree that, in our own defense, we must aid Britain, but—Here is the First Book to Tell How Much Aid England Must Have to Beat Hitler.

The author of "Fivefold Aid to Britain" is an internationally famous war economist, whose first warning in his famous book, "Germany and the Lightning War," Britain failed to heed until too late. His new book may be our last warning against Hitlerism. Read this factual evidence, graphically illustrated, and know how we can tip the scales to help Britain win and keep the U. S. out of war. Get your copy today.

$1

WITH CHARTS, GRAPHS AND PICTURES

THE JOHN DAY COMPANY, N. Y.

DRAMA

The Irish of It

AFTER the first three minutes it wouldn't be very hard to guess that "Tanyard Street" (Little Theater) comes to us by way of the Abbey in Dublin. Never having been, myself, any closer to Ireland than the harbor of Cobh, I don't know just how much stylization is involved in the making of the stage Irishman as the Abbey conceives him, but I do know that the characters of an Irish play have become almost as standardized as those of the *commedia del arte*.

There are usually three men and three women. First, there is the virile young man who distrusts priests and has an eye for the girls; second, the intense young man with a mystical turn and a love of his country; third, Mr. Barry Fitzgerald, a comic rapscallian well along in years. The three women are, respectively, a soubrette to flirt with the first man, an intense young girl to love the second, and, finally, a hard-working wife to support the third. Any others who may be introduced for the sake of variety are strictly minor and do not have much to do with the plot.

All this being true, such plays ought to be easy to deal with were it not for the fact that even rather inferior specimens of the genre so often manage to be flavorsome and interesting. Even aside from its conventionality, there are several reasons why "Tanyard Street" is not really a very good play, at least for American audiences. It turns around the case of a wounded soldier who is cured by what looks like a miracle but possibly isn't, and one is never quite sure just what the point which the author seems trying to make really is. Even if one did know, all this talk about the Church and its priests is obviously a good deal more exciting in a country like Ireland, which is seething with religious disputation, than it is in New York or than, for that matter, it would be in a country where established Catholicism was not a storm center. And yet I must report that I followed the play with a good deal more interest than seemed to me wholly explicable at the time, and I recommend it at least to those whose prejudice is favorable rather than unfavorable to the Irish school.

All this is certainly in considerable measure due to the inevitable but grateful presence of Barry Fitzgerald who has walked right out of something by Sean O'Casey and manages to be so funny as a hypochondriacal martyr to indigestion and soda bicarb that he very nearly steals the show. Yet he has so little to do with the plot that he wanders right out of the play again before it reaches its last big scene and leaves one ribald spectator wondering why the Virgin couldn't have paused a moment during her visitation to do something for his heartburn. Two other former Abbey players familiar to Broadway audiences, Arthur Shields and Aideen O'Connor, also do good work and so, for that matter, do the others, including Margo, who surprises everybody by turning up as a colleen.

But it isn't all the acting. Louis D'Alton, the author, has obviously picked up some useful hints from the works of other Abbey playwrights and he proves again that the Irish, at least as seen by Irish playwrights, are good dramatic subjects for a reason which also suggests why the English seem such bad ones in most contemporary English plays. To be too persistently concerned with good form and too afraid of any emphasis except that of understatement is likely to make one a rather dull protagonist. Your well-bred Englishman doesn't like to make a scene; but scenes are necessary to make a play. And that is where your stage Irishman comes in. He loves high talk and he loves a scene. Abbey plays are usually interesting, partly because everybody in them is so interested and so willing to show it.

"Liberty Jones" (Schubert Theater) resembles "Tanyard Street" in nothing at all except, perhaps, the fact that it too is somewhat more effective in the theater than any description is likely to suggest. Philip Barry, the author, has made rather a habit of going off deep ends whenever he gets tired of writing excellent polite comedy, but he has never thought of anything odder than this morality play with music. In the course of it Miss Liberty, sick unto death, is finally brought back to health and hope by a plain American named John Smith. Smith hates to commit himself, but finally decides not only that he is willing to marry and settle down but also that the proclamation "Give me liberty or give me death!" is not really old-fashioned. The method of the piece —a judicious compromise between the method of "Everyman" and that of the musical comedy—permits the author to scatter allegory so plentifully about that one is not always sure just how far one ought to exercise ingenuity in discovering meanings. The fact, for instance, that Mr. Smith, the liberal, doesn't learn to dance until he becomes enamored of Miss Liberty seems easy enough to interpret—but is it? Then I am not quite sure whether Miss Liberty's nice red head means something or not, and I haven't the faintest idea what significance ought to be found in the circumstance that, though she has a good enough figure of the bean-pole sort, she repeatedly hankers after what the old-fashioned advertisements used to call "bust development."

I do not believe that anyone since Bunyan has ever written a really popular allegory, and in general I still hold that it is not a currently valid form. To treat solemnly a subject as serious as the present one is almost inevitably to be a little fatuous; to make it merely entertainment is to risk the sort of vulgarity involved in designing street clothes or teagowns on "themes" suggested by national defense. But I must admit that Mr. Barry steers as successfully as anyone could between the two dangers and that his handsomely produced allegory is both more entertaining and less fatuous than I would have been inclined to believe possible.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

FILMS

HOW to reconcile politics and entertainment? The Hollywood studios can hardly ignore the world situation and are scheduled to produce a number of films on controversial themes. Americanism and Pan-Americanism, as well as the democratic anti-Nazi issue, are going to get a liberal share of attention, heaven knows with what results.

The potentialities in the Pan-American field are enormous: the good-neighbor campaign could be considerably furthered by a series of films with a Latin American background, providing that the subjects were handled with tact and intelligence. The possibilities are certainly not being overlooked and audiences are due for a good dose of bright Latin American adventure, but, judging by past performance and current production, it is questionable whether it will be entirely to the taste of our neighbors. Unfortunately, once it has made up its mind on a subject, Hollywood is quixotically loyal, and its conception of the other Americas is, to say the least, regrettable. To someone who knew Latin America only from the average film it must seem a very odd place indeed—hopelessly addicted to the rhumba, in-

habited by swarthy gigolos and torrid women who reply to any question put by their virile visiting cousins with shrill cries of *si si*, and are transported with delight by the brief and condescending visit of the white men from the U. S. A. who depart giving the impression that they will be back for another enjoyable romp when they can spare the time.

The reaction of the Latin American public to this type of film is expressed in terms that the industry should well be able to appreciate; box-office receipts from Latin American countries have recently shown a steady decline; no picture about them is even expected to make money there, and moreover visitors from the south have not hesitated to say that their countrymen would welcome a more courteous and accurate approach to the subject of their native lands. It is interesting to note in this connection that in Buenos Aires a local production, "Petroleo," concerned with the villainous activities of North American business men, is playing to packed houses. Germany and Italy are very active in the motion-picture field in Latin America, even financing production units in certain countries, and it seems that Hollywood would be well advised, both financially and politically, to produce pictures in which Latin Americans are treated as equals and not as a sub-race with amusing foibles.

Direct anti-Nazi propaganda also presents the industry with a slightly delicate problem. Again the question arises of the important Latin American market which is likely to be closed to any film that is too outspoken. For instance, both "The Great Dictator" and "The Mortal Storm" have encountered considerable difficulty in Latin America and they have been banned in certain places. Even the home market is becoming a little sated with the present anti-Nazi formula (sadistic storm-troopers, Jewish refugees with, of course, a liberal percentage of Aryan blood, and political persecution). All that has been done too many times and could readily be abandoned for something a little more constructive. What this might be is difficult to imagine, but in this connection as well as in many an other it is to be wished that the democracies would be a little clearer about their peace aims.

In dealing with Americanism the industry is on home ground. The historical approach may encounter a few snags, for historically just about the most American thing that ever happened is the War of Independence, but then of course the British can be conveniently divided into Whigs and Tories; also it can be implied that they have changed a good deal since then. Stories about the draft, with toughs and misfits making the grade, and some fun and adventure in the navy will about complete the program in the field in which the industry is likely to be most successful.

Internally the consent decree and the increasing movement toward the individual touch in pictures may influence the trend of production. The consent decree operates under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act to abolish block booking. Up to now independent exhibitors have been forced to purchase from the studios their entire stock of pictures for the year in a package like the stamp-dealer's assorted envelope—two Gables, a Claudette Colbert, and a Ginger Rogers, guaranteed to leaven a somewhat doughy remainder. The consent decree provides for a new process of movie selling. Independent exhibitors are offered films by the major studios, at a fixed percentage of the gross takings, in packages of five, any one of which they may refuse if they do not consider it good box-office, while accepting the remainder. The industry claims that this will result in the production of higher quality material, and a gradual disappearance of the double feature. Some independent exhibitors seem to think that it will not make much difference either way. They suspect that the producers will have an effective reply to any attempt to separate the wheat from the chaff by offering a package of five, for example, at 40 per cent of the gross takings and in the event of, say, three being accepted by the exhibitor stepping the percentage up perhaps to 70 per cent of the takings, making it hardly worth while to refuse. In the meanwhile a special unit is being set up to supervise the working of the decree, and exhibitors are earnestly invited to air complaints before the unit. Also, a special watch is being kept on purchases of independent theaters by the major studios, which might be considered an attempt to circumvent the workings of the decree.

The industry's sudden emphasis on the value of the individual touch in movie production has been a strange development. The policy of employing as many heads as possible has been suddenly recognized as remarkably unproductive of originality, and the achievements of certain men who were left more or less to themselves have inclined the studios toward allowing men of talent to perform as many of the functions of director, writer, and producer as possible. Preston Sturges is continuing his writer-director activities on a larger scale; Frank Capra and Robert Riskin, a remarkably successful writer-director combination, are branching out into the production end at Warner's, and Orson Welles's debut as director, author, and actor is awaited with keen anticipation for more reasons than one.

Mr. Welles's activities since he arrived in Hollywood have attracted much attention, and he has lived up to every expectation concerning his first picture "Citizen Kane." Mr. Hearst has kindly cooperated in publicizing the film by claiming that the story is based most libellously on his life and fulminating away in his Bavarian village in Northern California. He has been most lately reported as intending to sue every exhibitor who shows the picture. Other courses Mr. Hearst is reported to be contemplating are the complete ignoring in his papers of the activities of the RKO studios and attempting to involve the whole industry by starting a campaign against the aliens employed in it, simultaneously slinging some mud at the morals of the film colony. The industry should be able to deliver a few broadsides in reply and is not in a very weak position even on the count of alien employment, since of the few aliens employed, a very large proportion are in any case British. RKO may of course shelve the film, or alter it, but more likely will eventually show it in its present form. It will be a fascinating battle if the issue with Mr. Hearst is ever joined, and it will be interesting to see if, when he takes the lid off Hollywood, there will as usual be nothing but a few puffs of steam.

The most outstanding film to be previewed recently is the David Loew-Albert Lewin production "So Ends Our Night," adapted from "Flotsam" by Erich Maria Remarque. It is an anti-Nazi film on the rather familiar lines mentioned above (refugees shuttled helplessly about from country to country, Gestapo agents, sadistic storm-troopers, etc.). Margaret Sullavan and Fredric March are very good, while Glenn Ford, a newcomer of great charm and talent, will probably, as a result of his performance in this picture, be groomed beyond recognition and shortly emerge a full-fledged standardized star. John Cromwell has directed it with an admirably light touch, though he has out-Hitchcocked Hitchcock in the choice of grotesque extra and bit players, with not altogether happy results.

ANTHONY BOWER

MUSIC

THOUGH I missed the League of Composers' program of music for documentary films I had previously seen "The City," with its Aaron Copland score most of which—except the music for the traffic jam sequence—I had thought poor for its purpose. And last summer I had attended a private showing of "Valley Town" arranged by the Educational Film Institute for the music critics, to get their reactions to controversial features of the score by Marc Blitzstein. On that occasion, waiting for the other critics, who did not show up, I mentioned to a couple of Film Institute members the question in my mind whether music was essential to films, since with the pictures by themselves one not only could convey the bare sense of any situation but—through use of pictorial values, of pace, of cutting, and so on—should be able to give this sense almost any desired emotional heightening and impact. My question was brushed aside with an impatient "Music has always been part of films—like opera." True, there has been drama with music; but there has also been drama without it; by analogy there can be a film without music, which the resources of the medium should be able to make effective (and recently I had occasion to decide that parts of "Our Town" would have been more impressive alone than they were with Copland's music). Certainly I would expect that a documentary, which sets out to present a factual record of people and things as they are and as they function, would be such a film—would, that is, give only the music which happened to be part of the facts of a situation, like a song coming from a phonograph in a room. In a film like "Valley Town," then, I would expect shots of men working in a steel mill to be accompanied by the noises of the mill, not by "steel mill music" composed by Marc Blitzstein.

If, however, the shots of a steel mill are accompanied by music, this music must intensify the effect of the pictures in the way that music, if it is good for its purpose, intensifies the effect of the words and actions in an opera. And the first thing to say of Blitzstein's music for "Valley Town" is that it had no such value for its purpose. This was true of both the uncontroversial portions and the controversial ones, which I will now describe. The documentary film has its own conventions, most of which are derived from its very nature: one uses not actors but the people actually involved in the situation; one films only the things which these people actually do and say. An additional convention is the voice of the commentator, which, adding to what the film has recorded, may tell us what the people think. Now the man who made "Valley Town" went beyond these conventions when, filming an unemployed worker on his way home after a day's fruitless search for work, he did not have him say to another worker: "What am I goin' home for?" or did not have the commentator tell us of the despair in such men's minds, but had the worker himself think his thoughts aloud for us without moving his lips. This procedure Blitzstein carried a step further: at home the worker's wife *sang* her thoughts aloud. And this brings me to the second thing to say of Blitzstein's score—that while it did not offer any music with the significance and power that were required, it did offer a feature that was novel, daring, provocative of controversy.

I mention this because it is characteristic. Putting aside things like the burlesque torch song, I cannot conceive of sounds being feebler and flatter, sounds having less of the significance and effect they were intended to have, than the sounds which I heard during the first act of "No For An Answer"; but the act had its "Fra-a-a-ancie, ta-ta-ta-ta-ta" which was clever and amusing and covered Blitzstein's inability to write music for the emotions of a couple in love—or in fact for any serious emotions or situations whatever. And it was no less characteristic in Blitzstein's pre-proletarian period. Then as now he was a brilliantly gifted person, with the specifically musical gifts of a superb pianist, but—in my judgment—without the specific gift for composition, the ability not just to manipulate sounds but to manipulate them into designs that had artistic potency. Then as now he could not produce music of any importance but could think up something novel to claim attention with, like a string quartet with the three movements written *Largo, Largo, Largo,* and achieving differentiation through texture instead of pace.

At that time Blitzstein got the attention only of the few people interested in the novelty of a string quartet with the three movements written *Largo, Largo, Largo;* today he gets the attention of the larger number of people interested in dramatizations of the class struggle. Writing about Columbia's "Chain Gang" album last September, I pointed out that there were people who, because of what they felt about the cruelties inflicted on Negroes in chain gangs, would be moved by the songs in this album as they would not be if they heard the songs without the words or without any other knowledge of what they were about. Now, recalling the warmth of the Mecca Temple audience's response to Blitzstein's opera, I shiver a little at the thought of what this audience's response would have been to the music if it had been presented without the words or anything else to reveal its connection with unions and vigilantes. For I am sure the response would have been as frigid as the response of such an audience a few years ago to the quartet with the three movements written *Largo, Largo, Largo.*

B. H. HAGGIN

The
NATIONAL ARTS CLUB
15 GRAMERCY PARK
Sponsors
A CONCERT BY
FELIX SALMOND
World-Famous Cellist
FRIDAY EVENING
FEBRUARY 28 AT 8:45
At its Galleries
15 GRAMERCY PARK
Entire Proceeds
For the Benefit
of
THE FOSTER PARENTS' PLAN
FOR WAR CHILDREN, Inc.
TICKETS:
$1.00 AND $2.00
on sale at
THE NATIONAL ARTS CLUB
Telephone: GRamercy 5-3424
WALTER DAMROSCH
Honorary Chairman
PAINTING EXHIBITION

In Early Issues of The Nation
Herman Rauschning's
"The Redemption of Democracy"
Reviewed by Franz Hoellering
"Ambassador Dodd's Diary"
Reviewed by Edgar A. Mowrer

Letters to the Editors

Without Representation

Dear Sirs: Mr. Neuberger's article in your issue of February 1 calls attention to a problem affecting not only the states but also the federal House of Representatives. Many state governments have failed to redistrict for members of Congress as well as for state senators and assemblymen. As a result, a rotten-borough system of representation is growing up; New York State and Illinois are the chief offenders. In the former state the largest Congressional district has nearly nine times the population of the smallest; in the latter it has more than six times. But this inequality of representation is not between urban and rural as it usually is in state legislatures, for the largest and the smallest Congressional districts are in the one case in New York City and in the other in Chicago. The small districts are those out of which population has been drifting for years, as in lower Manhattan; the large districts those into which it has been flowing.

The evil is a growing one; the average percentage excess of the population of the largest Congressional district over that of the smallest in the same state was:

1900.... 41	1920.... 86
1910.... 54	1930....107

Mr. Neuberger is right in saying that only public opinion can force the state legislatures to restore an equitable representation. But cannot that public opinion work through a legal sanction more easily than through "an initiative petition" such as succeeded in the state of Washington?

The Congressional situation would be remedied if a provision included in all apportionment laws from 1872 on, until the law of 1929, should be reenacted with the addition of a sanction or penalty. The provision reads: "[Representatives] shall be elected by districts composed of contiguous territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants." This provision as it stood was merely advice ignored at pleasure by state legislatures; if a sanction were added, they would be forced to act. For example, the federal law might go on to say that if in any state the Congressional districts set up do not, in the judgment of the highest state court, consist of contiguous territory, or if the population of the largest district exceeds that of the smallest by more than one-half, or some other specified proportion, the districting shall be invalid and until the requirement is met all Congressmen in that state shall be elected on a blanket ticket.

To remedy the situation in the state legislatures a similar provision might be incorporated in the state constitutions.

WALTER F. WILLCOX

Ithaca, N. Y., February 1

Washington and Gates

Dear Sirs: In *The Nation* of January 18 W. E. Woodward reviewed my book, "Washington and the Revolution: A Reappraisal—Gates, Conway, and the Continental Congress." Of the dozen or more reviews of the book I have seen, some favorable, others not so favorable, this is the only one that seems unfair.

Mr. Woodward states: "The title of this book is somewhat misleading. Mr. Knollenberg does not cover all of George Washington's activities during the Revolution, but only a small part of them." The latter sentence is true, but the limited scope of the book is indicated by the subtitle, Gates, Conway, and the Continental Congress, as well as by my statement on the first page of the book: "Without purporting to offer a complete restudy of the war, I have undertaken to present certain episodes and characters in what I believe to be a truer light."

Continuing, Mr. Woodward says: "The value of Mr. Knollenberg's book, as a convincing document, is greatly diminished by his obvious bias against Washington. He . . . gives a general impression—without saying so definitely—that he was a second-rate person." In describing certain of Washington's limitations, I not only expressed my recognition of the fact that "Washington's qualities of greatness . . . tower above his limitations," but proceeded for two pages to set forth in detail my grounds for this statement.

Mr. Woodward remarks:

> Before Mr. Knollenberg became the librarian of Yale University he was a lawyer, and his book has all the earmarks of a corporation lawyer's argument in court. A brilliant lawyer, as you know, can take half a dozen minor facts and a few plausible assertions, and produce from them a document, with references and cross-references that will completely confuse both judge and jury.

Several of my critics complained that the flow of my narrative is impeded by an excess of evidence, and, while I did not wholly agree with these criticisms, I thought they were a fair expression of opinion. But Mr. Woodward's intimation that my book is built up on "half a dozen minor facts and a few plausible assertions" is the reverse of fairness and truth.

In my book I set forth evidence presenting Horatio Gates in a more favorable light as a general than is generally given. Mr. Woodward seeks to belittle Gates in his review by saying: "He was conceited, vain almost beyond belief." Mr. Woodward cast similar aspersions on Gates in his "George Washington: The Image and the Man." Neither in his book nor in his review of my book does he present any evidence in support of this statement, and I think the statement is incorrect.

It would be interesting to have Mr. Woodward produce his evidence.

BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG

New Haven, Conn., January 24

Beal's Defenders

Dear Sirs: Jonathan Daniels is safe in his Anthony pro Brutus defense of Fred Beal, for Fred Beal is in prison and cannot answer. Mr. Daniels perhaps intended to write a very kind article on Beal in the December 14 issue of *The Nation*. Why should the fat little ex-Communist who is doing laundry work in jail, whose work is forgotten by everybody, who is just a zero — why should he not get his freedom? Still, Fred Beal must have made quite an impression on several people. The Governor of North Carolina remembers well the Gastonia strike and considers Beal too dangerous to be released. And some other people remember him also. Mr. Daniels says: "Maybe he is even as *some* say, a rat, who snapped at the capitalists and ran out on the Communists."

The "some" to whom Mr. Daniels refers have certainly not forgotten Fred

INCREDIBLE—BUT TRUE!

Only $5 for a SIGNED ORIGINAL by GRANT WOOD, THOMAS BENTON or 65 other great Artists . . . if you act promptly!

An exciting new Art Program brings you museum-perfect limited-edition Etchings and Lithographs for a mere fraction of their actual value!

SEND FOR FREE 64-PAGE CATALOGUE

IF, like other persons of culture, you long to possess Signed Originals by famous living artists and have been deterred by prohibitive prices, here's the most *exciting* art news in a century!

THESE NOTED ARTISTS
George Biddle
Gordon Grant
Doris Lee
Aaron Bohrod
Peggy Bacon
Ernest Fiene
Albert Sterner
Adolf Dehn
Alexander Brook
William Gropper
George Grosz
. . . AND MANY OTHERS
See Free Catalogue

Sixty-seven of America's most famous artists now make it possible for you to own Signed Original Etchings and Lithographs such as acquired from this collection by the Metropolitan Museum, Chicago Art Institute and 81 other museums. And the price of these limited-edition Originals, many of them prize-winners, is only $5 each!

Send for FREE 64-page Catalogue

You can order direct from the catalogue which tells all details concerning this amazing new art program, illustrating over 140 subjects and giving size of each, names and biographies of artists, etc. If not completely satisfied your money will be refunded. Enclose 10c in stamps with the coupon for postage and handling. Address:

ASSOCIATED AMERICAN ARTISTS
Studio 82, 711 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Associated American Artists
Studio 82, 711 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Please mail me your FREE, 64-page Catalogue illustrating all Signed, Original Etchings and Lithographs available, explaining reasons for this American Artists' Program; giving artists' biographies and prizes won, etc. I enclose 10c in stamps for handling and postage.

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... State .....

Beal either. Who they are anyone can tell who knows that Fred Beal on his return from Russia wrote a book in which he exposed Stalinism.

ANTOINETTE F. KONIKOW

Boston, Mass., January 8

Dear Sirs: There was no intent on my part to slander Fred Beal; I simply wanted to draw a picture of him. I am sure that Beal himself understands and knows that nobody in the state where he is imprisoned is more anxious than I to see justice done him. I have been urging his pardon for some time. Those who prefer a prettier picture of him and his present state seems to me to be more concerned with appearances than with justice.

JONATHAN DANIELS

Raleigh, N. C., January 15

Beal Himself

Dear Sirs: Through you I would like to thank all my friends who, without monetary reward, are working quietly for my freedom.

I've been in prison now for three years. My sentence of twenty years was cut seven years by former Governor Clyde Hoey. I have grown to like the Southern people, especially my associates, who are sharecroppers, farmers, and textile workers.

I'm quite fat, weighing nearly two hundred pounds. Three years ago I weighed 227 pounds but I guess that it won't hurt me to toughen up a bit. Just now I'm working at building a dam. Four months ago I worked a while in the laundry, washing clothes for my convict associates. So far I have worked at over fifty different kinds of farm jobs. You know, I never worked on a farm before coming to prison.

I don't like Hitler, and I don't like Stalin. I hope the liberal brethren will not crack under the strain of the "democracy" that roars over my radio every night.

FRED E. BEAL

Halifax, N. C., January 21

Books for Southern Workers

Dear Sirs: More and more workers are using the facilities of the Southern Summer School library, and again we need more books or money to buy them with. This library is used for the resident section of the school at Asheville, North Carolina. Also throughout the entire year it lends collections of books to unions, clubs, and individual workers.

Although the chief need is for books in the field of the social sciences and for fiction, drama, and poetry with social import, volumes given need not be limited to those categories since an interested second-hand dealer gives the school a generous allowance of books not suitable for this library. Please send books to the Southern Summer School for Workers, 437 West Fifty-ninth Street, New York, or if in the city send a card asking that the books be called for.

RITA S. HILBORN,
Chairman, Library Committee

New York, December 15

CONTRIBUTORS

FRANZ HOELLERING was a journalist in Berlin until Hitler came to power. He is a native of Vienna, the locale of his recent novel, "The Defenders."

HAROLD J. LASKI, a leading member of the left wing of the British Labor Party, is professor of political science at the London School of Economics.

IRVING DILLIARD, who has been an editorial writer on the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* for the past ten years, was one of the first Nieman fellows in journalism at Harvard University.

SHERMAN CONRAD is an associate of the School of Letters at Iowa University.

PAUL M. SWEEZY is instructor in economics at Harvard University.

LOUIS B. SALOMON, a member of the English Department of Brooklyn College, reviews fiction regularly for *The Nation*.

ANTHONY BOWER begins in this issue a regularly fortnightly column from Holywood. He was formerly film critic for the *New Statesman and Nation*.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

Coming soon in The Nation

"De Gaulle at Dakar"
by JUAN S. DIDARTE

"Britain's Home Guard"
by PATRICIA STRAUSS

A M E

VOLUME

IN

THE S

EDITO

Ben St

The Fa

Hitler

Franco

ARTICL

The Fr

De Ga

Britain

Americ

Bulgari

In the

A Nati

BOOKS

Idea-Id

Mystery

China i

Religiou

African

Search f

Aesthet

In Brief

Drama:

by Jos

Music

LETTER

Managing E

ROBERT BEN

Published wee

55 Fifth Aven

Building, Was

1879, at the Po